THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

Vol. CXL, No. 3 March, 1959

CONTENTS

Christian Landmarks ....*John L. Murphy* 145

History and the Resurrection: A Contemporary Appraisal
Francis X. Murphy, C.SS.R. 152

Reflections on "A Complete Mariology"
Eamon R. Carroll, O.Carm. 159

The Last Supper: Tuesday or Thursday? Part II.
Robert F. McDonald, S.J. 168

Francois Mauriac and Theology ...*David Granfield, O.S.B.* 182

The Decrees of the Biblical Commission ..*Eamonn O'Doherty* 188

Unity and Peace ....*Joseph Clifford Fenton* 192

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

John P. McCormick, S.S., and Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R.

Defective Host 195

Lifting the Chasuble 195

Covering the Ciborium 195

Minor Ministers 196

The Bell at Mass 196

The Nuptial Blessing 197

(Contents Continued on Next Page)

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States, Canada, $5.00; Foreign, $5.00; 50 cents per copy.

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D. C.

Copyright 1959 by the Catholic University of America Press.

(Contents continued from previous page)

Punishment of War Criminals 197
Medical Experimentation on Condemned Criminals 199
The Extent of Temporary Faculties 201

BOOK REVIEWS

Towards a New World, *by Ricardo Lombardi, S.J.* 203
Basil Anthony Mary Moreau, *by Canon Etienne Catta and Tony Catta* 206
Patterns for Educational Growth, *by Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C.* 208
Worship: The Life of the Missions, *by Johannes Hofinger, S.J.* 209
The Angels, *by Pascal P. Parente* 212
An American Amen, *by John LaFarge* 212
BOOK NOTES 214
BOOKS RECEIVED 215

Institute of Spiritual Theology

Eighth Summer Session

July 6 to July 31

DOMINICAN HOUSE OF STUDIES

River Forest, Illinois

An integrated course in spiritual theology and allied subjects for the spiritual director offered to all priests and professed brothers by a staff of Dominican Theologians.

Full course complete in three summer sessions.

Limited accommodations for resident students.

For information and prospectus write to

Father Jordan Aumann, O. P.
Dominican House of Studies,
River Forest, Illinois.

CHRISTIAN LANDMARKS

To certain generations is given the inestimable favor of witnessing particularly dramatic and important events in the course of human history. It is the realization of this fact that brought forth in the entire Catholic world a sense of wonderment when it was first announced that Pope John XXIII had decided to convoke an Ecumenical Council. Only twenty times in the long history of the Church has the world witnessed such an event; whole generations have lived and died without ever viewing this aspect of the Church's life. Little wonder, then, that the announcement was greeted with such enthusiasm.

There is much that might be said about a Council, its meaning, its purpose, the history of past Councils. The central element, however, is something less obvious yet more profound. That which is most striking is what we might call the "mystery" of the Council. Like all the varied facets in the life of the Church, the General Council also shares in the supernatural quality of that life. It is far more than a gathering-together of bishops in a certain place; it is far more than solemnity and color. It is, above all this, a *special manifestation of the Holy Spirit,* the Advocate whom Christ had promised to send to His Church to dwell with it forever. In this lies the essential "mystery" of the Council.

As a glance at the list of Ecumenical Councils will indicate, they have been celebrated in many different places, under many and diverse circumstances. There has been great variety in the external ceremony and color; great diversity in the number of bishops who attended, ranging from as few as one hundred to as many as one thousand bishops and prelates. Some Councils have continued for years; others have been completed in a matter of days. Some were great spectacles before the world, causing great comment on all sides; others were celebrated in such fashion that parts of the Catholic world scarcely knew that they were going on. Yet through them all there runs a single thread that ties them together in significant fashion, distinguishing them from all other "local" or "particular" councils that were held at various times and places, upon occasion with even greater external solemnity and larger numbers. That single thread is this special working of the Holy Spirit which comes into play at an Ecumenical Council.

The difference between a General Council and a local council, then, is not to be sought primarily in the legal requirements upon which they are based. The current legislation of the Church is a formulation of the underlying theological truth. The significance of a General Council springs from the inner nature of the Church established by Christ. In other words, it is not fundamentally a question of how many bishops must attend, or from what parts of the world they must actually come, or by what papal decree they are ratified. These are important questions, of course; but it is the supernatural life of the Church which gives meaning to them all.

Apart from the technical distinctions, we can perceive the difference between the Ecumenical Councils and local gatherings by regarding the impact of these Councils on the life of the Church. It is in this that the "mystery" of a General Council appears in its most profound fashion. The Church of Christ is a living thing, and as such it grasps in a living fashion the activity of the Holy Spirit within it. The history of certain of our Ecumenical Councils is shrouded in a good amount of obscurity. Special questions may be raised concerning precisely who convoked the Council, who attended it, and what its precise relationship to the Bishop of Rome might have been. In the life of the Church, however, the matter shines forth with considerably more clarity. The Church of Christ has *de facto* recognized certain Councils as ecumenical, and the decrees of these gatherings have accordingly played a special role in the life of Christ's members. They stand out, not simply as solemn and colorful gatherings of ecclesiastics, but as *Christian landmarks.* They shine through the centuries as beacons, directing the life of the Church, outlining through the darkness the path to be followed.

The influence and the effect of these Councils has possibly been felt more with the passing of time than it was at the moment of their solemn closing. When the color and ceremonial had vanished, and the bishops and prelates had returned to their own Sees, then it was that the Council began to exert its real influence, that the Holy Spirit began to accomplish in fact those goals that had been set forth, that the faithful began to incorporate even more firmly into their lives those doctrines which had been solemnly defined. The influence of a General Council is never felt fully in a day or a month or even years: but it *is* recognized, and in ways far superior to the effect of other local or particular councils of lesser authority.

An Ecumenical Council stands apart, then, from all other gatherings within the Church. It is not just another meeting. It is the most solemn expression of the doctrinal and disciplinary life of the infallible Church of Christ upon earth, "the pillar and mainstay of the truth." In the discussions and debates which preceded its decrees, the precise meaning of Christian truth has been brought out more clearly under the direction of the Holy Spirit. The Council thereupon sums up this teaching, and gives the proper directives for the years which lie ahead.

We may say, as a result, that in these Ecumenical Councils God has visited His people in a special manner, the Holy Spirit has shown forth His power in an extraordinary fashion. Christ, the divine Head of the Church, has willed to gather together His bishops, in union with His vicar on earth and under the direction of the Holy Spirit, in order to discuss the content of Christian truth and to set it forth in more exact terminology, and to establish that discipline needed to accomplish the goals envisioned by Christ for His Church. Thus in every General Council, the Mystical Body of Christ has repeated that intimate collaboration with the Spirit of Truth which animates it, and at the end, its bishops can repeat with the apostolic college: "For the Holy Spirit and we have decided. . . ."

If we look back to the fourth century, we find the first such solemn gathering within the Church: the Council of Nicea (325). The Church had just been officially recognized; the years of persecution were over, and Christianity was no longer a crime. Constantine had become the first Christian emperor, and under him the bishops of the Church were invited to gather together in order to settle the problem raised by Arius. Arianism did not die the day that the solemn declaration was signed at Nicea, but it was doomed: doomed by that which the Church had uttered in such solemn fashion through the Holy Spirit.

There had been other councils before the time of Nicea. From a technical point of view, they were particular councils rather than General Councils because they failed to represent properly the deliberation of the entire Church. From a theological point of view, however, we can perceive the workings of the Holy Spirit at Nicea in a fashion more profound and more solemn than elsewhere. It was for this reason that Nicea became the first conciliar landmark. Those who continued to dispute these questions in the years that followed

Nicea argued always from the decree of that Council and in its terminology. Nicea became the norm, the beacon of all that was said; it was henceforth the center of the discussion, and in this way pointed out the path to be followed by the members of Christ's Church.

As time passed, other such "landmarks" of Christian life came into being. Acting under the special guidance of the Holy Spirit, the Church spoke over and over again in this most solemn fashion, reflecting the ever-present life it draws from the Spirit of Truth within it. For more than three hundred years, problems continued to arise concerning Christ and the Trinity, and one by one the great Councils of the early Church came forth to point out the proper solutions: Constantinople I (381); Ephesus (431); Chalcedon (451); Constantinople II (553); Constantinople III (680-81). When finally this sixth Ecumenical Council drew to a close, the great and basic Christian teachings on Christ and the Trinity were safely secured. These names became important in the Christian vocabulary, just as the doctrines proposed in these Councils became important in the lives of faithful Christians down to this very hour.

Other problems and errors arose through the years, and with time, one or another Council was convened to deal with them. The history of the Councils is, in reality, a history of the Church: of the doctrinal and disciplinary questions with which she was particularly concerned. All of them, however, have one special point in common: they stood out over and above all other ecclesiastical gatherings, and became especially important in the life of the Church. Because of the special influence of the Holy Spirit in these most solemn gatherings, they were destined to over-shadow the many local councils and synods held in the same centuries.

Thus in the eighth century a new problem arose, an attack now not so much on a belief as on a practice closely associated with faith: the use of images in Christian life. The answer of Nicea II (787) was so clear, so direct that it became the watchword of the Christian world, justifying the proper use of images by the Church of God against all future attacks.

It is a strange thing, also, that the eighth Ecumenical Council, Constantinople IV (869-70), was called for one of the very same reasons given by Pope John XXIII for summoning a Council today: to seek to reunite those Christians who have become separated from

Rome. This has been a recurring concern in the Church of Christ. The efforts of these various Councils have not always met with the success that might have been hoped for; God does not force the human will to co-operate with grace. These Councils were not failures, however, in the sense that they failed to give the directives needed. When Christianity was split, the faithful of the world were able to look up to these conciliar decrees and draw from them the guidance and advice they sought, and the doctrinal clarity they required.

When the first big split appeared in the schism of Photius, the eighth General Council succeeded in eventually warding off a full break, It was, however, a temporary gain. In 1054, Michael Caerularius, the Patriarch of Constantinople, was to renew the break, one that lasted until the present day. But the Church of Christ has not ceased to show forth her desire for Christian unity. In addition to Constantinople IV, two other Councils—Lyons II (1274) and Florence (1438-45)—bear eloquent testimony to this concern of the Church, of the urging of the Holy Spirit for that oneness proper to the Mystical Body of Christ.

The Middle Ages were also times of new concerns and new Councils. Other errors, both doctrinal and disciplinary, had crept into the life of the Church. Lay investiture and simony had arisen, even false Popes had contended for the See of Peter. Clerical discipline and morality was failing, and heretics were striking out against the visible Church and the sacraments. Again the Church of God spoke out in the Spirit of Truth. In quick succession, four General Councils were celebrated in the Mother Church of the city of Rome, St. John Lateran: Lateran I (1123), II (1139), III (1179) and IV (1215). Four Councils in less than one hundred years, each of them faced with overwhelming problems. It was a difficult struggle, yet the influence of these gatherings became increasingly apparent. It was not a complete triumph; not even a General Council can change men into new creatures overnight. But saints did rise up and heresies died away, and the Church which had celebrated these four solemn Councils lived on to overcome the weaknesses discovered even within itself.

Possibly the greatest problem of that entire age was the question of the papacy. When evil strikes in high places, the whole Body is confused. In the twelfth century, the anti-Pope, Anacletus II, challenged the lawful successor of St. Peter. The First Council of the Lateran had to deal with this problem following the death of Anacletus. This was, however, only a faint shadow of the confusion which was to arise toward the end of the fourteenth century: the great Western Schism. Not two, but three men claimed to be the lawful Pope, and they each had successors who continued these claims. It was to the Council of Constance (1414-18) that the Christian world looked for a solution to this train of confusion. Perhaps never before or after did the Holy Spirit speak through a more stormy Council, but speak He did. When the confusion abated, the Christian world had returned to a state of stability as Martin V emerged as the first undisputed Pope in many years.

Another problem shook the medieval Church: the relationship between the temporal and the spiritual power. The struggle between the two came to a head in the thirteenth Ecumenical Council: Lyons I (1245). The Emperor Constantine had assumed an important role in summoning the first General Council, but the thirteenth century viewed something quite different. In order to assert its independence in the spiritual order, the Church now met in solemn fashion to excommunicate a different Christian emperor, Frederick II. The "*Unam sanctam*" of Boniface VIII may be the strongest statement of the Church's position on this problem in the Middle Ages, but what was accomplished at Lyons certainly led the way.

The problem of Church reform in general had occupied the minds of churchmen for many years. Not only the four Lateran Councils, but also the Council of Vienne (1311-12) and Lateran V (1512-17) treated of this problem. Complete success, however, was never achieved, and it took the Protestant Reformation to shake the Western world into decisive action. In response to this there arose the greatest of all the reform Councils, one which has also gone down in history as one of the greatest of doctrinal Councils as well: Trent (1545-63). On and off for eighteen years, this Council met, and what it accomplished is known to the entire world. The Catholic world that we know today, especially in regard to Church discipline, is a post-Tridentine world in large measure. Trent is a Christian landmark of which men today are still extremely conscious.

The most recent Council of all, however, was the Vatican Council (1869-70). Externally it was one of the most solemn and without doubt, the most obviously "universal." Bishops from literally all over the world traveled to attend. The modern world had become confused on many points of central interest. Doubt and insecurity raged on all sides; the message of Christian truth seemed to be in danger of lapsing into a formless mass of individualism and indifferentism. Modern man no longer knew for sure what he believed or what he ought to believe; he simultaneously exalted human reason to the utmost and still doubted its validity. He lived in scepticism and unbelief.

In the midst of all of this, Christ spoke once again through His Spirit and through His Church, outlining the rational basis of faith, the supernatural nature of the Church, and—what attracted attention most of all—the security to be achieved through adherence to the vicar of Christ, whose solemn decrees were defined as infallible. Never in the history of the Church had an Ecumenical Council been held apart from the Pope, but now, for the first time, such a Council solemnly defined for the Christian world the doctrine of papal infallibility, so long accepted by the Church. The words of this Council are still re-echoing in our ears today.

It is, then, in a spirit of hushed expectancy that the Church now awaits the coming of a new Council. God is about to visit His people again in an extraordinary manner; the Holy Spirit—the Soul of the Mystical Body—is about to move men once more to declare in outright fashion the truth revealed by Christ, and to invite others throughout the entire world to join in the unity of Christ's body, in the communal profession of the Christian faith.

The "mystery" of the Council is about to be enacted before our very eyes. The forthcoming Council will rise up as a new Christian landmark, the twenty-first, to serve as a guide for the years that lie ahead. Without question, it will be one of the most solemn and colorful of all such Ecumenical Councils; and in its external representation, it will surely be the most "universal," drawing together a greater number of bishops than ever before, from all parts of the world to speak, under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, to this frightened and divided world in which we find ourselves today.

JOHN L. MURPHY

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

HISTORY AND THE RESURRECTION
A CONTEMPORARY APPRAISAL

The religious belief of over 820 million people living in today's world looks to the Resurrection of Jesus Christ as an historical happening. To the vast majority of Christians, Easter Sunday is thus more than a mere anniversary. It is the proclamation of an actual return from the grave of a man called Jesus Christ who had been put to death outside Jerusalem under Pontius Pilate in the year 30 A.D.

It is normal, of course, that so startling an assertion should have met with disbelief and denial; that over the course of nineteen hundred years it should have served as a touchstone of belief, as well as a basic issue for religious difference and controversy. Affirmed as a fact, it has been denied as a fancy. Accepted as an article of faith, it has been rejected as an impossibility of science. Ousted as an historical reality in the nineteenth century, it has been welcomed back as a biblical necessity in the twentieth.

It thus seems fitting to make an appraisal of this claim in the light of the tremendous scientific advance of which the mid-twentieth century gives evidence. It is imperative to place the resurrection in perspective *vis-à-vis* the historical discovery and intellectual progress that characterize modern man's interests mid-way through the atomic and inter-spatial age.

It was a dogma of nineteenth century science that the laws of nature, and therefore of the physical constitution of the universe, were constant, absolute and irreversible. The biologist, the physicist, the geologist, and the naturalist felt that the rigor of their method in digging into the phenomena of the physical world was the one absolute of which man could be certain. Passionate devotion to this principle led to the unloosening of many of the secrets of nature—from harnessing the combustible property of petroleum, for example, to dissecting the atom and releasing the tremendous force of nuclear energy. But in the process of discovery the bottom fell out of the scientist's certainty.

First Euclidian mathematics bowed before a variety of numerical structures built upon non-Euclidian postulates. Then Newtonian physics were found wanting in the face of the space-and-time exigencies of the Einsteinian formulae. Finally the failure of the sub-atomic world to conform to preconceived patterns of structural and behavior prediction brought about the fantastic suggestion that perhaps the laws of causality were not the absolute guide-lines that scientists had believed them to be.

This last startling reversal of common sense as well as logical necessity has been rejected. For it was found hopelessly confusing the task of the scientist in his pursuit of any kind of truth or knowledge whatever, not to mention his delving into the constitutive elements of natural phenomena.

But the temptation to jettison the laws of causality has changed the perspective of modern science, among other things warning the physical scientists away from the hope of discovering simplicity at the heart of nature; and therefore of making scientific knowledge the final measure of reality. It has likewise removed some of the *hybris* with which many scientists had been wont to substitute their opinions for religious dogmas.

What the new approach amounts to is not a conviction that the laws of nature are obsolete; or that they are not to be considered constant and invariable. The laws of nature are discoverable, and ordinarily speaking they are both constant and invariable. But the fear of finding final chaos instead of order in the universe has served as a cautionary advisement that the scientist is not to over-step the confines of his *métier* and call something absolutely impossible, which is merely inconceivable within the range of the particular scientist's own competence.

It was by introducing the pseudo-absolutes of nineteenth century science into the historical perspective, particularly when dealing with early Christianity, that the late nineteenth century historians proved themselves untrue to the requirements of their own discipline, as their modern critics have shouted from the housetops. But even more blame-worthy were the rationalist theologians of the last century who in their zeal to keep faith with science stripped religion of its supernatural content, eschewed the miraculous, and so shredded the Scriptures as to leave the impression that both the Old and the New Testament were a series of pious folk-lore and legend with little claim to be the existentialistic word of God—and much less, truly historical documents.

Instead of following the Rankean dictum of portraying the facts as the record clearly displayed them, the rationalist theologians, while claiming to approach the Resurrection from a strictly historical viewpoint, actually attempted to explain away the very phenomena upon which their interests were centered. Taking refuge in hypotheses ranging from a denial of the historicity of the Gospel accounts, to theories of mass hallucination and deception, these so-called rationalists gave rise to a pattern of propaganda in which the Resurrection came to stand for an idealization of the memory of Christ in the mind of the early Christians. Moved by the mystique of apostolic preaching, it was held, the infant Christian community gradually rose to a consideration of Christ as a divine being. Under the influence of hellenistic philosophy and gnostic cult awareness, it was to be expected that the early Christians would come to think of Christ as not only alive and in glory; but in the late first and early second centuries, it was only normal that under the pressure of propaganda and controversy, they should have come to claim that Christ had arisen from the dead.

That this theory of a gradual divinization of Christ in the mind of the first Christians ran counter to traditional claims of the historical reality of Christ's Resurrection seemed to be the final reason for accepting it. For the nineteenth century had experienced a revolution in the approach to the discipline of history that was the equivalent of the renovation that characterized the physical sciences in the same period. Hence an approach that had the distinction of being at once both radical and "debunking" was quickly welcomed as an addition to the modern outlook.

Unfortunately for these theologians and publicists, two things happened that had not been considered possible, let alone probable in the field of scripture study. One was the discovery of archeological remains, and above all of manuscripts, in a field that had long been considered hopeless. The other was a return to a common sense viewpoint in dealing with the historical data and scriptural phenomena that encompassed early Christianity.

It was Adolph Harnack, himself a leading rationalist theologian and historian of early Christianity, whose final, almost violent reaction to the nonsensical theories that littered New Testament studies at the start of the twentieth century started the return to traditional attitudes as regards the dates and the authorship of the biblical narratives. In particular he proved conclusively that the Third Gospel was the work of St. Luke the physician, and that it was written somewhere between 60 and 65 A.D. Then Sir William Ramsay, the noted British archeologist, turned the full focus of his discipline and discoveries upon the trustworthiness of the New Testament. With great reluctance, and many a rear-guard action, the majority of the more competent of early Christianity's historians and exegetes have had to conform to the view that the New Testament documents are for the most part solid historical sources.

It was the discovery of several verses concerned with the passion narrative of the Fourth Gospel written on papyri in Alexandria (that can only be dated from about 125 A.D.) that has closed an interminable debate centered on the claim that the Johannine Gospel must have been of late second century manufacture, and was only explainable in terms of Greek philosophy and gnostic mystery. On all sides today, it is acknowledged that the Fourth Gospel could have been and was a product of a strictly Jewish, first century religious and intellectual milieu. This has recently been substantiated by the discoveries in the Qumrân documents of the Dead Sea, whose witness gives a clear picture of closed types of ascetical Jewish communities whose religious beliefs and practices foreshadowed many features of early Christianity.

In reference to the Gospels themselves, it is now recognized that these documents were only comparatively late in composition—probably written between 60 and 95 A.D.—and that they were compilations of the preachings of the Apostles, aligned according to the particular thesis of the individual Evangelist. They contain the so-called "sayings of Jesus," His parables and axioms, as well as the record of His birth, life, death and resurrection—all these things either directly remembered by the writer himself or culled from the community's fund of catechetical instruction.

A type of biblical investigation that looks to the sources of the gospel narratives, the literary genre of the episodes narrated, and the structure of the traditions handed down in the primitive Church has been classified under the German title of *Formgeschichte*. Used at first by the critics of the traditional approach to the Scriptures, this type of investigation has now demonstrated beyond shadow of doubt that the gospel message was first spread by preaching, and that certain set formulas for enunciating the principal truths of the new faith were early decided upon. And what appears incontestable is the fact that the very first thing the earliest preachers of the good news of Chrisianity announced was the stupendous fact that Jesus Christ had arisen from the dead.

This is the message with which Peter faces the startled world of Jerusalem on the first Pentecost: "Men of Israel, hear these words. Jesus of Nazareth was a man approved by God among you by miracles and wonders and signs, which God did through him in the midst of you, as you yourselves know. Him, when delivered up by the settled purpose and foreknowledge of God, you have crucified and slain by the hands of wicked men. *But God has raised him up,* having loosed the sorrows of hell, because it was not possible that he should be held fast by it." (*Acts* 2:22-25.) Peter continues by referring to the tomb of David still among them, "David," he says, "who forseeing, spoke of the resurrection of Christ."

The fact of the Resurrection is likewise the constant and absolute theme of St. Paul in his Epistles as well as in the record of his preaching as set down in the Acts of the Apostles. Nor does Paul hesitate to call this incredible fact to the attention of the Roman governor Festus and the Jewish king Agrippa at Caesarea in 58 A.D. saying when Festus suggested that his great learning was driving him to madness: "I am not mad excellent Festus, but I speak words of sober truth. For the king [Agrippa] knows about these things and to him also I speak without hesitation. For I am sure that none of these things escaped him; for none of them happened in a corner." (*Acts* 26:25-28)

What is remarkable about the progress made in recent study of the New Testament is the conclusion that long before the Gospels came to be written down, there was a definite and decided way in which the message of Christianity was preached. And this message began with an insistence upon the fact of the Resurrection. Further, this so-called Easter message of the Apostles was based upon an appeal to both historical and doctrinal facts which, until recent times, the rationalist critics had attempted to play down, claiming that the recitation of the sayings and doings of Christ in the scripture narratives were devoid of historical significance.

What we now appreciate much better is the fact that in contrast to the dynamic preaching recorded in Acts, and to the formulas of faith spelled out in the Epistles, the Gospels give evidence of a tradition already crystallized and of a doctrine well set and developed regarding the person and the doings of Christ. Thus in reference to the Resurrection the Evangelists merely narrate as well-known facts the more important episodes that followed upon the discovery of the empty tomb and the apparitions to the disciples. It is only from Acts and the Epistles that we are able to piece together the impact of this story on the daily life of the early Christian community, reflected as it is in the preaching, the liturgical prayers and the catechetical formulas. It is in these latter activities that we see so clearly the insistence upon the Resurrection as the central doctrine of primitive Christianity.

It was this aspect of the belief of the early Church that had first to be clarified and understood before the Resurrection could be viewed properly in reference to the advances of modern science and the intellectual accomplishments of twentieth century man.

Certainly there is no excuse for the historian today, and much less for the theologian, to fall into the errors of technique pursued by their predecessors of even two or three generations ago. Struck as were the critics by the startling claims of the Resurrection, and caught in the cross-fire of the positivism of the scientists, they had run helter-skelter to the naturalists, and were told that such a thing as the return to life of a man actually dead was an utter physical impossibility. Misconstruing this apodictical dogma to mean that there was no force capable of interfering with the laws of nature in a particular instance for an other-worldly purpose, the historian turned back on the sources of his information, turned them upside down, and in the process stultified his own integrity by denying the obvious foundations of his own discipline.

Today, from a scientist's viewpoint as well as from that of the man in the street, it is still extremely difficult to accept this all but incredible claim that Jesus Christ arose from the dead. But there is no good reason for discounting the historical data that records the witness of Peter, James and John, and the other disciples in which they maintain that they saw, touched and ate with the risen Christ. For the claim is made in the midst of what otherwise proves to be exceptionally trustworthy historical evidence. The scientist may still be justified in claiming that in keeping with the limits of his competency, a resurrection is impossible. As long as he stops there he is well within the prerogatives of his discipline. It is then up to each individual to assess the historical evidence himself before he decides on the basis of his own religious tenets whether or not he can accept the Resurrection. But he must realize that there is absolutely nothing preventing him from recognizing the Resurrection of Jesus Christ as an historical fact before it becomes a matter for spiritual belief.

FRANCIS X. MURPHY, C.SS.R.

Fort Hamilton
Brooklyn, N. Y.

REFLECTIONS ON "A COMPLETE MARIOLOGY"

An important new book on our Lady has just appeared: *A Complete Mariology,* by C. X. J. M. Friethoff, O.P.[1] The name of Caspar Friethoff, former Angelicum professor at Rome, is an honored one in the field of Mariology. Up to now, however, English readers have had very few opportunities of becoming acquainted with Father Friethoff's many essays on the theology of our Lady. The best example that comes to mind is "The Dogmatic Definition of the Assumption," which appeared in *The Thomist* in 1951.[2] *A Complete Mariology* represents the summing-up of three decades of study; the author presents it as "the whole of Marian doctrine . . . in a really systematic whole."

The Dutch original appeared in 1953, and was based on a series of fifty magazine articles that had appeared in *De Standaard van Maria* since 1939.[3] Like the articles, the book is designed not only for priests and seminarians, but for educated Catholics. It is closely-knit, showing no trace of the fragmentary character that sometimes mars books based on periodical articles. Moreover *A Complete Mariology* is not loaded down with footnotes, for practically all the material is incorporated into the main stream of the smooth-flowing account.

The master-plan is set forth in an introductory chapter and chart.[4] The book is divided into three main parts. Part I concerns "the role allotted to Mary"—divine motherhood, new Eve. Part II takes up one aspect of the full triumph of the Mother of God and new Eve over the devil; this section is titled "never conquered by Satan," and covers the Immaculate Conception, holiness, virginity and marriage, freedom from concupiscence, and the Assumption. Part III considers

[1] C. X. J. M. Friethoff, O.P., *A Complete Mariology,* translated by a Religious of the Retreat of the Sacred Heart (London: Blackfriars Publications, and Westminster, Md.: The Newman Press, 1958), pp. xiv + 287.

[2] Friethoff, "The Dogmatic Definition of the Assumption," *The Thomist,* XIV (January, 1951), 41-58.

[3] Friethoff, *Volledige Marialeer* (Hilversum: N. V. Gooi & Sticht, 1953).

[4] This chart, with a brief commentary, also appeared in a translation by Peter Nillissen, S.M., as "Marian Synthesis," in *The Marianist,* XLVI (December, 1955), 9-12.

the other aspect of Mary's triumph over Lucifer: "the complete overthrow of Satan"—firstly, through cooperation with Christ in his salvific work on earth; secondly, by applying the fruits of the redemption.

The completeness announced by the name, *A Complete Mariology,* does not pretend to encyclopedic dimensions; it refers rather to the organic fashion in which the author has assembled his materials. Father Friethoff has taken the principal truths about our Lady, both defined dogmas and commonly held doctrines, sought out their mutual harmonies, and arranged them scientifically, as an organized body of truths. There are very few matters of Mariological moment that pass unnoticed. Among the lacunae, a consideration of the relation of Mary to the Church would have been a useful addition, especially in view of the emphasis on this promising theme in recent times. The Mary-Church relationship was the motif of the Lourdes, 1958, international Mariological congress. And in 1951-1953 the French Mariologists devoted three annual meetings to this one subject. The Mariological Society of America considered it at the ninth annual convention.[5]

The reader would also benefit from at least a brief discussion of the principles of the science of Marian theology. And more notice might have been taken of the problem of Mary's knowledge, especially her awareness of her Son's divinity.[6] How fully did she realize at the Annunciation that the Holy One to be born of her was literally God-made-man? The question is pointed up by recent scriptural studies.[7] Mary lived by faith. What development did her faith undergo concerning Christ himself?

The defined truths—divine maternity, virginity, Immaculate Conception, and Assumption — receive thorough treatment. Under "Mother of God," Friethoff also considers the cult of our Lady: "honouring Mary."[8] Certain seldom-treated topics are given adequate consideration. "Mary, His Wife" explains the true marriage of Mary and Joseph, with an extended exegetical aside concerning the "brethren" of the Gospels and their likely blood relationship to Christ.[9]

---

[5] Cf. *Marian Studies,* IX (1958), entirely on the Mary-Church analogy.

[6] Friethoff, *A Complete Mariology,* pp. 24-5.

[7] E.g., René Laurentin, *Structure et théologie de Luc I-II* (Paris, 1957).

[8] Friethoff, *A Complete Mariology,* pp. 27-32.

[9] *Ibid.,* pp. 129-142.

Mary's emotional life is studied in the chapter "The Morning Star." The English translation of the general remarks on emotional life in the first pages of this chapter is unusually involved, and the useful comparative chart of the emotions in the Dutch original has been left out, but nonetheless it is enlightening reading. Friethoff follows the view that the Blessed Virgin's freedom from concupiscence is not an automatic consequence of immunity from original sin, but rather, like the Immaculate Conception itself, an integral part of her total victory over Satan.

I wonder very strongly however if the debatable *debitum,* so famous in discussions about our Lady's freedom from original sin, can be identified as a "concupiscence before conception." "This rebellious character of the senses before the actual conception—that is, before the infusion of the reasonable soul—is called *'debitum'* (necessity), and afterwards it is called evil concupiscence."[10] Is Friethoff making the *debitum* the same thing as concupiscence? Is he thereby arguing that because Mary had the *debitum* (he insists that she did), she would also have had concupiscence, notwithstanding her Immaculate Conception, if God had not kept her immune from such sense-rebellion? Friethoff's position is one he has long defended; he refers to his own 1933 article in *Angelicum.*[11]

Moreover, what is this mysterious *debitum*? In what true sense can it be said that "Mary must (was bound to) have contracted original sin?"[12] A re-assessment of the whole *debitum* concept is taking place in modern Mariology. It strikes this writer that the classic *debitum* is in part a carry-over from polemic positions taken when the revealed character of the Immaculate Conception was still being debated, and in part a repetition without much reflection of a rather unfortunate term.

The French Dominican, M.-J. Nicolas, cuts through spurious "traditional teaching" in a paper presented at the Roman Mariological congress, 1954:

> Of itself, the word *debitum* has an overly-moral sense. For Mary there is evidently no moral or penal obligation of contracting original sin, but only a necessity intrinsically attached to the nature that she

---

[10] *Ibid.,* p. 101.

[11] Friethoff, "Quomodo caro B.M.V. in originali concepta fuit," *Angelicum,* X (1933).

[12] Friethoff, *A Complete Mariology,* p. 57. Cf. also p. 101.

receives from Adam. A debt evokes the idea of a fault, or at least of something that has to be repaired . . . Scotus said . . . that every Son of Adam at the instant of his conception is "*debitor iustitiae originalis*" with the exception of Mary. The reason is that original sin constitutes a debt: *debitium iustitiae, debitum mortis,* and to speak of the "debt of this debt" is to multiply confusion. Therefore, let us not speak of a *debitum remotum* or a *debitum proximum,* but of the necessity of contracting original sin, the necessity of sharing in the sin of nature: an intrinsic necessity affecting the person of Mary by the fact alone that she begins to exist in the nature that fell in Adam without the taint of anything sinful, *sine ulla peccati labe,* and the grace of the Immaculate Conception delivers her from this necessity before it can produce its effect.[13]

The most original and valuable section of the book is Part III, "the complete overthrow of Satan." In 1936 Father Friethoff published *Alma Socia Christi Redemptoris.* The last part of *A Complete Mariology* deals with the same theme. Here again the author follows his orderly procedure of first explaining carefully the theological point at issue, applying it to Christ where possible, and finally developing the Marian aspect. In Part III he takes up chapter by chapter the major elements in Christ's redemptive work: merit, satisfaction, ransom, atonement. Only then does he move on to the chapters, "Mediatrix of All Graces," and "Suppliant Omnipotence," dealing with the fact and manner of Mary's dispensation of all graces. The book closes with an informative discussion of our Lady's queenship, and a concluding chapter, "Mother of Men."

Many theologians distinguish in the redemption the "objective salvation," and the "subjective redemption." Christ accomplished the objective salvation by his life on earth, especially by His sacrificial death and glorious resurrection. Friethoff continually calls this the "general *causality* of salvation." The "subjective redemption" is the application of the fruits of the objective redemption to individuals by the distribution of grace; Friethoff calls it "the phase of the *application* of the general causality of salvation."

---

[13] Marie-Joseph Nicolas, O.P., "Sublimiori modo redempta," in *Virgo Immaculata,* IX (1957), 1-15, especially page 8. (The article is in French.) Cf. also the similar remarks by the same author in the important work just published: *The Dogma of the Immaculate Conception,* edited by Edward D. O'Connor, C.S.C. (University of Notre Dame Press, 1958), in the essay, "The Meaning of the Immaculate Conception in the Perspective of St. Thomas," pp. 327-45, especially page 334.

The manner of Mary's co-operation in the objective redemptive work of Christ is a very live subject in modern Mariology, and there are sharp divisions of opinion. A major problem is the fact that Mary herself owes her salvation to the Redeemer. Friethoff poses the problem fairly and defends the view that Mary's co-operation in the "general causality of salvation" (objective redemption) was proximate, although of course in strict dependence on Christ's unique mediatorship.

The usual fourfold division of the functions of Christ's saving work is followed—merit, satisfaction, redemption in the strict sense of ransom, atonement (sacrifice). Each is first explored from the soteriological standpoint, and then Mary's share is explained. The chapter "Co-Meriting" is a brilliant treatment of difficult material, marred at times by the heavy-handed translation.[14] In his earlier writings Friethoff described Mary's corredemptive merits as *de congruo.* He now shares the preference of many Spanish theologians for "merits *de condigno* in a special sense" because of Mary's social role. "Mary merited for us *de condigno,* but in a definite respect, what Jesus merited *de condigno* and absolutely. So that Jesus merited, in strict justice and superabundantly, what Mary could merit according to a relative equality in virtue of God's promise. . . .[15]

The term redemption, used in a strict sense, means ransom from captivity. In the chapter "Co-Redemptress," Friethoff considers the common objection that Mary cannot be co-redemptrix because she was also redeemed. His answer is:

> Just as Jesus did not make satisfaction for her, because she was never a sinner, he did not redeem her either because she had never lacked the liberty of God's children and had never been in the slavery of sin. But just as he merited for her that grace should forestall sin in her, he also merited for her that the same grace should preserve her from slavery. Therefore the definition of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception does not speak of her Redeemer, but of her *Saviour.*[16]

Friethoff in this respect departs from the more usual position of the defenders of the *debitum,* who say that the Blessed Virgin was *redeemed* from the necessity of contracting original sin. However, it is hard to see how he can rest his case even in part on such slim evidence as the substitution of the word "Saviour" in the formula of the Immaculate Conception definition in place of the word "Redeemer," which is used in the similar earlier phrase of Alexander VII's *Sollicitudo.*[17] Both the context of *Ineffabilis Deus* and the Marian year encyclical, *Fulgens corona,* demonstrate that preservation from original sin demands, if it does not include, the true redemption of Mary: "For it is obvious, if we go fully and carefully into the question, that Christ our Lord did in fact *redeem* His Mother, and that in the most perfect way, since it was by His merits that she was preserved by God from every hereditary stain of sin."[18]

---

[14] Line 10 of page 200 is an obvious misprint; it should read: "merits *de condigno.*"

[15] Friethoff, *A Complete Mariology,* p. 202.

[16] *Ibid.,* p. 228. Cf. also p. 61.

A strong point and a good one on Mary's general co-redemptive activity is the union of will and suffering between Jesus and Mary. What causes Christ's suffering also causes Mary's. As His Mother, she bears His anguish with Him.

> Even without Mary's collaboration, nothing would have been lacking to Jesus's satisfaction, just as nothing was added to it by her collaboration. . . . Mary did not add a part to Jesus's part as though only by adding one part to the other a sufficient total could be reached. No, she added her part, that is her "bit," to Jesus's total, so that her part might in this way acquire a value which it did not possess on its own account. For now Mary is Jesus's partner: she fulfills an official function and it reaches higher than she would be able to do without that elevation.[19] [And similarly for the atonement]: Mary's own dolours were . . . added to Jesus's own sufferings, both bore and joined in bearing the same Passion. This made it possible for Mary's compassion to acquire, as co-payment for the ransom of our liberty, the character of co-redemption. But it was co-payment of the price that Jesus paid, and therefore did not add redemption to redemption! By her compassion, her bearing of Jesus's Passion with him, Mary was able to *co-operate* in the redemption accomplished by Jesus.[20]

In discussing disputed doctrinal points, Friethoff often begins by stating the opposite view as convincingly as he can, and only then presenting his own opinion. A judicious use of punctuation marks, particularly exclamation points, made this technique more obvious in the original Dutch. A rapid reader of the English edition should be careful not to be caught unawares.[21] There are times also when the difference between what is of Catholic faith or proximate to faith, and what is the realm of open debate, might be more clearly indicated, e.g., in the summing up of the questions on meriting the Incarnation.

---

[17] Denz. 1100.

[18] Pius XII, *Fulgens corona,* in *A.A.S.,* XLV (1953), 581.

[19] Friethoff, *A Complete Mariology,* p. 208.

[20] *Ibid.,* p. 239. A one-sentence summary of Mary's share in the atonement is mistranslated; it should read: "In his own power he sacrificed himself for our advantage: in his power she joined in sacrificing *him* for our advantage" (p. 242).

The original edition included a bibliography of articles, almost entirely in the Dutch language, arranged according to various headings: general, Mother of God, new Eve, etc. It is regrettable that translator and publisher did not substitute a similar English reading list in this version. Admittedly reference to *Mariale Dagen* (the proceedings of the Dutch language Mariologists of The Netherlands and Belgium) would be impossible to read, even if available, for most English speakers, but comparable articles are now at hand in the ten annual *Marian Studies* published to date, as well as similar materials.[22] And in certain respects the reader would profit also from more recent bibliography on some of the disputed questions that are not extensively treated in *A Complete Mariology,* e.g., the nature of Mary's intent to remain a Virgin before and at the Annunciation.

The reader will readily understand Father Friethoff's reputation as a very clear teacher. In writing for a larger audience he has not forgotten the classroom technique of breaking down difficult concepts into smaller, more intelligible units. A balanced and beautiful use is made of the writings of the Fathers, Saints, and great theologians of the past, and of papal and episcopal letters of the present. St. Pius X's Immaculate Conception anniversary encyclical, *Ad diem illum,* is frequently and tellingly employed; and the author makes a good case for translating in a past sense the controverted "promeret" of the passage: "she merited [promeret] for us *de congruo,* as it is called, what Christ merited [promeruit] *de condigno. . . .*[23]

---

[21] *Ibid.,* p. 170 is a good example of this. With some reluctance the writer feels obliged to comment on the translation. Making an English version from the Dutch is an especially difficult task, but both translator and publisher assume certain obligations towards their readers in attempting it. The Dutch idiom comes through again and again, and a good many words look like they were picked from a Dutch-English dictionary, convincing me that the translator was someone whose native language was not English. Almost certainly more than one hand had a share in the translation; some of the closing chapters, for example, quote paragraphs from earlier chapters in new and improved translations. Some sections are very well translated, as the chapter, "Making Satisfaction with Jesus." The later chapters fare better in English than the earlier ones. A few examples of translation failings will suffice. "Civilization" (p. 65) should read "civility." "A convention" (pp. 151, 154) should read "argument from fittingness." The correct meaning of the Tridentine passage quoted from Denzinger (p. 241) is that Christ could in no sense offer sacrifice for Himself, because He was sinless. Some of the more philosophical or technically theological passages come through very poorly, e.g. page 153 on the causality of the divine motherhood.

[22] E.g., *Studies in Praise of Our Blessed Mother,* edited by J. Fenton and E. Benard (Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1952), and the *Marian Reprints* of the University of Dayton Marian Library.

There are many delightful asides relating Marian doctrine to modern times, to the spiritual life, to everyday needs. One good example is the paragraph on our Lady, Mother of priests:

> A priest's non-sacramental actions are directed to his sacramental ones; but all the sacraments find their consummation in the Sacrament of sacraments, the most Holy Eucharist. But as the consecration of the bread and wine is so closely connected with her, who was honoured by God with such a glorious role in the work of saving souls, the whole sacerdotal task, and hence also the person of the priest, must be under Mary's special protection. Let it then be true that the consecrated priest possesses an effect of grace, that Mary does not formally possess—she can neither consecrate nor give absolution—on the other hand, all (the others) are inferior to Mary as particular causes are to the general cause in the same order. Hence too Mary is called the Mother of priests.[24]

Other examples of felicitous observations are the suggestions on prayer, with our Lord as the example,[25] and the well-turned phrase on the Holy Office: "Therefore after the example of the Congregation of the Holy Office—which exists for the protection of the purity of our faith—we may name her truly our co-Redemptress."[26]

Another good feature is the fact that Friethoff is not afraid to change his opinion on open questions, and in this mature study chooses views he did not always hold. Concerning our Lady's death, he now states: "Yet my opinion is, that on account of the 'triumphant final sign of Christ's victory,' Mary died also. And that this is the feeling of the Church. . . ."[27]

---

[23] Friethoff, *A Complete Mariology,* pp. 194 ff.

[24] *Ibid.,* pp. 244-5.

[25] *Ibid.,* p. 262.

[26] *Ibid.,* p. 226.

[27] *Ibid.,* p. 162. The words in the inner quotation marks are from *Munificentissimus Deus* and concern Christ's glorious resurrection from the grave.

Even while taking exception to certain positions of Father Friethoff and to the imperfections of the translation, this writer wishes to state enthusiastically that *A Complete Mariology* is a valuable addition to the doctrinal books on our Lady now available in English.

EAMON R. CARROLL, O.CARM.

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

The leading article in *The American Ecclesiastical Review* for March, 1909, by Fr. J. Fryar, of Canterbury, England, is entitled "Church Bells." The author possesses an extensive knowledge of his subject when he narrates the origin of bells as a part of church equipment, and discusses bell-ringing as an art, some of the more famous church bells in England and the inscriptions that are found on some of the ancient bells. . . . Fr. M. Martin, S.J., contributes another instalment of his explanation of the new apostolic constitution *Sapienti consilio,* reorganizing the Roman Curia. . . . Fr. S. M. Hogan, O.P., writing from Australia, discusses the teaching of Savanarola on preaching and preachers. He tells us that the controversial friar had the gift of popularizing theology in his sermons, and insisted that preachers make frequent use of passages from the Sacred Scripture. . . . Fr. J. Murphy, of Philadelphia, contributes an interesting and instructive article on "The Diplomatic Agents of the Holy See," explaining the offices of apocrisiary (particularly the papal envoy to the court of the emperor at Constantinople in the early centuries), apostolic vicars, and the various types of legates (*ex officio, missi,* and *a latere*), as well as the Royal Legation of Sicily (abolished in 1871). . . . Three more chapters of *The Blindness of the Reverend Dr. Gray,* Canon Sheehan's novel of clerical life, appear in this issue. . . . In the *Analecta* we find the letter of Cardinal Merry del Val to the Apostolic Delegate, commanding that in future secular candidates to the subdiaconate in the United States shall be ordained under the title *servitii ecclesiae* instead of *missionis,* the title heretofore used. . . . A decree from the Congregation of Rites allows the use of beeswax instead of olive oil for the sanctuary lamp if the Ordinary gives consent. . . . It is noted that the first number of the *Acta apostolicae sedis* has been published. . . . A number of letters are printed in the Studies and Conferences section (one from the celebrated English convert Fr. Robert Hugh Benson) concerning the feasibility of using the vernacular in the official liturgy of the Church. The majority of the writers are opposed to such a change.

F. J. C.

THE LAST SUPPER: TUESDAY OR THURSDAY?

II

Before actually taking up the calendar, Mlle. Jaubert pauses to examine two rather limited attempts to reconcile the traditions concerning the Last Supper.[1] Bearing these in mind when we approach the calendar itself, we can readily appreciate her enthusiasm for it.

The first such attempt at reconciliation is given by Justin Martyr (ca. 135): "It is on the day of the Pasch that you arrested Him and on the day of the Pasch that you crucified Him."[2] It is really no attempt at putting the two traditions together, but it is of value in that it preserves elements of both. It becomes intelligible, if there was a second calendar involved besides the one in common use in Our Lord's time. Then there could really have been two Paschs, and Justin's phrase is not devoid of meaning. It certainly seems that it would be unexplainable, without the *Didascalia* and Jaubert's calendar.

The second and more recent attempt to arrive at an answer and one which defends the Tuesday tradition is given by Karl Holl. There are two points to his argumentation as reported by Jaubert.[3] First he argues that the Tuesday tradition is more linked up with the traditional dates for fasting in the Jewish liturgy, Wednesdays and Fridays. We have already seen this in the *Didascalia*.[4] Holl further cites Peter of Alexandria (d. 311) on this point:

> . . . No one will blame us for observing the fourth and sixth days of the week. According to tradition we are rightly expected to fast on these days, the fourth day because the Jewish plot to betray the Lord got under way then, the sixth because He suffered for us [on that day].[5]

---

[1] Jaubert, *La date,* pp. 152-4; *The Book,* pp. 99 and 92.

[2] Justin Martyr, *Dialogus cum Tryphone Judaeo,* III, 3 (*PG,* 6, 731).

[3] Jaubert, *La date,* pp. 153-4; *The Book,* p. 92. (Jaubert does not consider Holl's point of view as fully in the book as in her earlier article.) Holl probably approaches the problem from his interest in Epiphanius, and has edited "Die handschriftliche Ueberlieferung des Epiphanius," *Texte und Untersuchungen,* 36 (1910), 1-98.

[4] Cf. *AER,* CXL (Feb., 1959), 81-85.

[5] *Epistola canonica,* c. 15 (*PG,* 18, 507). Jaubert has also indicated on the question of Wednesdays and Fridays, Nau's edition of the *Didascalia of*

Holl's second argument for the Tuesday tradition is this: since the Thursday tradition won out, the Tuesday tradition would never have even won a hearing, unless it had some strong backing. But Jaubert rightly evaluates Holl's second argument as one without any real basis, unless we can find the backing he argues to.

Jaubert contends that we find a foundation for the Tuesday tradition, if we turn to the old sacerdotal calendar which was in use among the Jews until the second century B.C. Once she has established the existence of this calendar and its agreement with the testimony in the *Didascalia,* the only thing left for Jaubert to take up is the delicate question of its further agreement with the gospel narratives. This is the order then throughout the rest of her article.[6]

The nature of the old sacerdotal calendar can be reconstructed by studying the narrative content of the books of *Jubilees,* the Pentateuch, *Chronicles* and *Esdras* as Jaubert has done.[7] "It is the sacred and honored calendar of [the record] of the deluge, the journey in the desert, and the liturgical feasts according to the documents of the priests."[8]

The calendar apparently went out of common circulation due to the exile and imprisonment of the Jews and the subsequent infiltration of other cultures into their own. By Our Lord's time its existence is almost unknown. Here is a sketch of its history:

> As far as its sources are concerned, Mlle. Jaubert has shown conclusively that it is the calendar used in Ezechiel, used by the editors of the Pentateuch and of Chronicles. It goes back at least to the time of the exile. Could it not be still older than that? In all probability this religious calendar of Israel is a replica of the religious calendar of Egypt, in which the year was made up of twelve months of thirty days each, with five intercalary days. There is nothing to prevent us from assuming that it came from the Egyptians by way of the Phoenicians, at the start of the monarchy in Israel. Whatever may have been the changes introduced into the calendar after the exile (the divi-

---

Addai, 2, 3, p. 225; and Malan Lonon's 1882 edition of *Combat of Adam and Eve,* p. 82.

[6] Jaubert, *La date,* pp. 155-68; *The Book,* pp. 13 ff., and 122 ff. That the present paper may not become too long, I have left out the extension Jaubert makes of the calendar to the liturgy in general, pp. 168-73.

[7] Cf. Jaubert, "Le calendrier des Jubilés et de la secte de Qumrân. Ses origines bibliques," *Vetus Testamentum,* 3 (1953), 250-64.

[8] Jaubert, *La date,* p. 155; *The Book,* pp. 13-30.

sion into four seasons under the influence of the Greeks, and four intercalary days) it remained in use at the Temple until the Hellenistic period. But in civil life, ever since the time of the Persians, the lunar-solar calendar of the Babylonians was used.[9]

According to the latest investigations we know that the calendar of the book of *Jubilees* was used by the Essenes at Qumrân, and, for all we know, it may have been a desire to preserve it that lead to their abandoning Jerusalem for the desert.[10]

As far as its construction is concerned:

> The year is composed "of only 364 days" (*Jub.* 6, 38), a number [evenly] divisible by seven; it has twelve months of thirty days each with four intercalary days, one for each trimestre. Each trimestre, or season, has exactly thirteen weeks (*Jub.* 6, 29) and the days of the week are evenly divided between the trimesters. New Year's Day, as well as the first day of each trimester always falls on a Wednesday (i.e. the first day of the first, fourth, seventh, and tenth months). The dates of the festival days are rigorously fixed, each day of the month falling regularly on the same day of the week.[11]

The important point to note about this calendar, as seen in the last sentence of the quotation above, is its fixed and regular character. Here is a table representing one of the four seasons. It is the same for all the other seasons:[12]

Days of the Month		*Months*	
	1st, 4th, 7th, 10th	*2nd, 5th, 8th, 11th*	*3rd, 6th, 9th, 12th*
4th (Wed.)	1, 8, 15, 22, 29	6, 13, 20, 27	4, 11, 18, 25
5th (Thurs.)	2, 9, 16, 23, 30	7, 14, 21, 28	5, 12, 19, 26
6th (Friday)	3, 10, 17, 24	1, 8, 15, 22, 29	6, 13, 20, 27
Sabbath	4, 11, 18, 25	2, 9, 16, 23, 30	7, 14, 21, 28
1st (Sunday)	5, 12, 19, 26	3, 10, 17, 24	1, 8, 15, 22, 29
2nd (Monday)	6, 13, 20, 27	4, 11, 18, 25	2, 9, 16, 23, 30
3rd (Tuesday)	7, 14, 21, 28	5, 12, 19, 26	3, 10, 17, 24, 31

---

[9] J. T. Milik, *Dix ans de découvertes dans la désert de Juda* (Paris: Cerf, 1957), pp. 73-4.

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 74.

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 70. Cf. also R. H. Charles (editor): *The Book of Jubilees* (London: Macmillan, 1917), pp. 66, 64.

[12] *Ibid.*, p. 71.

The events of Holy Week took place in the First Month (according to the oldest Jewish usage the months were referred to numerically and had no special names), or, as it was later called the month of Nisan. The Law of Moses prescribed that the paschal lamb was to be eaten on the evening of the fourteenth day of the First Month: "And you shall keep it until the fourteenth day of this month: and the whole multitude of the children of Israel shall sacrifice it in the evening."[13]

A glance at the table above will show us that the fourteenth of the First Month was a Tuesday.[14] Now this is precisely the day given in the *Didascalia* for the Last Supper: ". . . after having eaten the Pasch, on Tuesday night . . ."[15] Jaubert is convinced that the sacerdotal calendar is the foundation for the Tuesday tradition recorded in the *Didascalia*. It got into the book without the knowledge of its author or editor, as witness his awkward attempt to explain the early date for the Last Supper by conjecturing some plot on the part of the Jews to advance the date for the Pasch.[16]

It will be helpful, before we go into the question of reconciling the old sacerdotal calendar with the Gospel accounts, under the guidance of Mlle. Jaubert, to show the chronology of Holy Week according to the two calendars. This table is a combination of the table previously given and the dates for the legal calendar as given in the *Didascalia*.[17]

Old Calendar:	12	13	**14**	15	16	17	18	19
	Sun.	Mon.	Tues.	Wed.	Thur.	Fri.	Sat.	Sun.
New Calendar:	9	10	11	12	13	**14**	15	16

As can be seen from this table there were two Paschs in Holy Week. Our Lord, knowing that He could not fulfill the stipulation of *Exodus* 12, 6 with the new calendar, had recourse to the *old* calendar. *Exodus* required that the Pasch be eaten on the evening of the fourteenth of the first month. But Our Lord knew He would be dead on Friday evening, so He ate the Pasch on the evening of the fourteenth according to the old calendar of *Jubilees*: a Tuesday.

---

[13] *Exodus* 12:6.

[14] Jaubert is following the suggestion of P. D. Barthélémy here that the first day of the year was a Wednesday according to *Gen.* 1:14. Cf. *Revue Biblique,* 59 (1952), 199-203, and also Cabrol and Leclercq, *op. cit.,* p. 148, where St. Anatolius Alexandrinus seems to bear out the suggestion of Barthélémy.

[15] Jaubert, *La date,* p. 142; *The Book,* p. 82.

[16] Jaubert, *La date,* p. 156; *The Book,* p. 86.

[17] Jaubert, *La date,* p. 143; *The Book,* p. 82. Cf. also *AER,* CXL, 2 (Feb., 1959), 81, note 11.

The explanation just given enables us to clear up the mystery we started with at the beginning of this paper: "Did Our Lord eat a paschal meal, or not?" Here is Jaubert's enthusiastic resolution of the contradiction that faced us before on this question:

> It hits you between the eyes that this hypothesis alone enables us to resolve the conflict between the Johannine tradition and the Synoptic tradition concerning the day of Jesus's death. The synoptic Gospels tell us that Jesus's last meal was a paschal meal, and implicitly they refer to the *old* sacerdotal calendar [*Mt* 26:27; *Mk* 14:12; *Lk* 22:7]. The Johannine tradition, which lays stress upon the symbolism behind Jesus's death—the sacrifice of the Paschal Lamb—treats only of the legal Pasch, and, from this point of view, simply places the Last Supper "*before* the feast of the Pasch" (*Jn* 13:1). The Last Supper and the Crucifixion both took place on the eve of the Pasch, but not of the *same* Pasch. [18]

According to Jaubert then, the chronology of the Synoptic Gospels seems to follow the old calendar, while St. John, for reasons of his own, prefers to use the current legal calendar. Bearing this difference in mind we can advance with Jaubert to the solution of a second problem: the interval of time *between* the anointing at Bethany and the Pasch. In St. John's Gospel (12:1) the anointing at Bethany takes place six days before the Pasch, while in *Matt.* 26:2 and *Mark* 14:1 it takes place two days before the Pasch.[19] This is obviously a difficult, if not impossible, problem to solve, if there is question of only one Pasch. This would mean there were two anointings at Bethany, one on Saturday, and one on Wednesday, counting back, from the legal Pasch of Friday, the respective number of days in John and in the Synoptics. In this way we may be said to solve one problem only at the expense of creating a new one. However, if John were using the legal calendar, and the Synoptics the old sacerdotal calendar of *Jubilees,* then counting back the respective six days and two days from the different Paschs we arrive at Saturday evening (or Sunday morning, depending on how you wish to look at it) for both the Synoptics and John. So we have only *one* anointing at Bethany, but we have two Paschs, and hence the two differently specified intervals.

---

[18] Jaubert, *La date,* p. 157; *The Book,* pp. 107-111.

[19] *Luke* 22:1 has only that the Pasch was approaching; he gives no date.

Jaubert seems to have found an alternate reading for *Mark* 14:1: "*hote to pascha ethuon:* when the customary Pasch [came]," which she believes would strengthen the position that the Synoptics were using the old sacerdotal calendar, the "customary" one:

> No doubt Mark must be taken to mean the sacrifice of the Pasch [as it was observed] in the milieu that followed the old sacerdotal traditions—unless the phrase is just a later gloss.[20]

The last phrase and caution puts us on our guard here, since it is a very shaky point. There is no suggestion of an alternate reading in the books I have checked on the point.[21] Actually, it is of minor importance, and the Synoptic dependence on the calendar of *Jubilees* seems clear enough without it.

The third and greatest difficulty Jaubert takes up in her effort to fit the calendar of *Jubilees* in with the Gospel accounts of the Passion is the fact that neither St. John nor the Synoptics mention anything about Our Lord being in prison for three days, a point essential to the Tuesday tradition. A key to the solution of this problem is presented to us by the fact that the Gospels simply narrate too many events for them all to have happened in the one night from Thursday to Friday, in the supposition that the Last Supper took place on Thursday. Jaubert spends three pages (pp. 159-161) cataloging the events that took place. I shall review them quickly. When you see them all together, it is hard to escape the conclusion Jaubert points to: the two and one-half days the Tuesday tradition would give us would be just about enough time for all of this to take place. Whether the Gospels mention it or not, the longer interval seems to be a physical necessity.

---

[20] Jaubert, *La date*, p. 157. *The Book* makes no mention of this.

[21] Cf. B. F. Westcott and F. J. A. Hort, *The New Testament* (London: Macmillan, 1904, 1st ed.), p. 105; A. Merk, S.J., *Novum Testamentum* (Rome: Biblical Pontifical Institute, 1951, 7th ed.), p. 171; A. Huck, *Synopsis of the First Three Gospels* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1954, 9th ed.), p. 182; G. Abbott-Smith, *A Manual Greek Lexicon of the New Testament* (Edinburgh: Clark, 1954, 3rd ed.), p. 130; *Greek-English Concordance* (Scottdale, Pa.: Herald Press, 1955), p. 100.

In our catalog of events we begin with the Last Supper itself. It had to begin on the evening of the fourteenth of the First Month, sometime after six o'clock.[22] The Synoptics make the meal a short one, but John stretches it out over several chapters.[23] Even granting that the events John recounts may not all necessarily have taken place then, we may at least conclude that the meal took some time longer than the Synoptics suggest. Humanly speaking Our Lord would probably have wanted to take His time, since this was to be His last meal with His own. After the meal we have a walk to the Garden of Olives, the repeated prayers of Our Lord, and His coming and going between the sleeping disciples and His place of prayer.[24] Our Lord watches the crowd make its way into the Garden in the darkness to arrest Him.[25] There is the incident of the initial resistance of St. Peter, the healing of the servant's ear, the awe of the crowd before Christ and its apparent reluctance to take Him.[26] Finally, Our Lord is led away to the high priest where the whole Sanhedrin gathers together.[27] It must have taken some time for these men to assemble, all seventy-two of them, plus the scribes and clerks who kept the records and so on. It took more time to get witnesses to testify against Jesus.[28] There is a second plenary meeting of the Sanhedrin early in the morning and then He is taken to Pilate.[29] We know that Pilate took his time and dragged out the proceedings interrogating Our Lord and the people assembled several times.[30] Our Lord is sent off to Herod through the holiday-crowded streets, and Herod rouses all his court out of bed at an early hour to see the wonder-worker.[31] Jesus stood there in silence and we may be justified in conjecturing that Herod toyed with Our Lord for some time in an effort not to appear too ridiculous. Our Lord is sent back to Pilate, again through the holiday crowds blocking the narrow streets. Pilate again assembled all the priests, who seem in the meantime to have dispersed.[32] Jaubert observes that, even though only Luke preserves the Herod incident for us, Matthew also seems to have tried to account for a passage of time here by introducing the account of Judas's death.[33] Matthew also has Pilate's wife send out a message to her husband that he should: ". . . have nothing to do with this just man." She had had a troubled dream about Him.[34] This would seem more plausible if the two appearances before Pilate had taken place on two separate days. In any event Pilate delays over the incident of Barabbas, and the scourging and mocking of the soldiers also took time.[35] Then, finally we have the painful journey to the place of crucifixion and Our Lord is nailed to the cross.[36]

---

[22] *Exodus* 12:6.

[23] *Matt.* 26:20-9; *Mark* 14:17-25; *Luke* 22:14-38; *John* 13:1; 17:26.

[24] *Matt.* 26:30-46; *Mark* 14:26-42; *Luke* 22:39-46. *John* 18:1 only records the trip to the Garden.

[25] *John* 18:3 describes them as having lanterns and torches, so it must have been dark by this time.

[26] *Matt.* 26:51-4; *Mark* 14:47; *Luke* 22:50-1; *John* 18:4-11.

[27] *Mark* 14:53.

[28] *Mark* 14:55-8; *Matt.* 26:60 f.

[29] *Mark* 15:1.

[30] *Mark* 15:2-5; *Matt.* 27:11-14.

[31] *Luke* 23:6-16.

The description we have just given has not only a great number of events involving crowds of people, but it has all the psychological elements of a long, dragged-out affair, which could hardly be packed into the short night given us by the Thursday tradition. As we have noted before, Jaubert observes that even with the Tuesday tradition we have just enough time to get everything in.

In connection with this discussion of the element of time Jaubert brings up two added points for our consideration. They militate against the Thursday tradition and for the Tuesday tradition. The first is a question of textual criticism: was Our Lord crucified at nine o'clock on Friday morning or at noon? The second point is one of legal procedure: did the Jews observe the legal requirements for a two-day trial in Our Lord's case?[37]

GAMMA OR DIGAMMA

As regards the first of these points Jaubert points out the apparent lack of agreement in the account of *Mark* 15:25, and that of *John* 19:14. The former has it that Our Lord was crucified at the third hour of the day, at nine o'clock in the morning, Friday; the latter puts it at the sixth hour, or at noon. Jaubert cites the evidence pro and con on this point.[38] Epiphanius in the *Chronicon paschale* says that both John and Mark held the third hour, but that a change of the symbol *gamma* for the third hour was introduced into some of the manuscripts, making it a *digamma,* the symbol for the sixth hour.[39] This seems to be borne out by the notation in Merk's critical apparatus for *John* 19:14, where several manuscripts, notably a correction in the Sinaiticus, and the Greek of the Beza, have the third hour instead of the sixth.[40] There is also further testimony that Our Lord was crucified at nine o'clock in the *Didascalia,*[41] the *Apostolic Tradition* and *Canons* of Hippolytus,[42] and lastly in the *Testament of Our Saviour Jesus Christ.*[43] But this is balanced by testimony in favor of the sixth hour.[44] Right now it does not seem that we can come to a decision on this point, but if the sixth hour of John's Gospel is not the correct time, then the amount of time we have in which to fit all the previously mentioned events is noticeably shortened and by as much as three hours. The Thursday hypothesis can ill afford to lose this time!

---

[32] *Luke* 23:13.

[33] Jaubert, *La date*, p. 160; *Matt.* 27:3-10; *The Book*, p. 118.

[34] *Matt.* 27:19.

[35] *Matt.* 27:15-26; *Mark* 15:6-15; *Luke* 23:13-25. Cf. also *Matt.* 27:27-31; *Mark* 15:16-20.

[36] *Matt.* 27:32-5; *Mark* 15:21-4; *Luke* 23:26-33.

[37] Jaubert, *La date*, pp. 161-3; *The Book*, pp. 119-20 and 123 ff.

[38] Jaubert, *La date*, p. 161; *The Book*, pp. 119-20.

The second of these complementary points connected with the time interval between the Last Supper and the crucifixion is that concerning the legal requirements for the trial Our Lord had. Jaubert calls attention to the requirements of the *Mishna,* the disciplinary code of the rabbis, on this point:

> In non-capital cases they hold the trial during the daytime and the verdict may be reached during the night; in capital cases they hold the trial during the daytime and the verdict also must be reached during the daytime. In non-capital cases the verdict, whether of acquittal or of conviction, may be reached the same day; in capital cases a verdict of acquittal may be reached on the same day, but a verdict of conviction not until the following day. Therefore trials may not be held on the eve of a Sabbath or on the eve of a Festival-day.[45]

---

[39] *Ibid.*

[40] Mark, *op. cit.*, p. 383.

[41] Jaubert refers to Nau's edition of the *Didascalia,* XIV, 9. Cf. also Jaubert, *La date,* pp. 142-3; *The Book,* p. 119.

[42] G. Dix, *Treatise on the Apostolic Tradition of Saint Hippolytus of Rome* (New York: Macmillan, 1937), pp. 62-3.

[43] I. E. Rahmani, II, *Testament of Our Lord* (Moguntiae, 1899), pp. 144-5, No. 14.

[44] Jaubert, *La date,* p. 161; *The Book,* p. 119.

[45] Jaubert, *La date,* p. 162; *The Book,* p. 123. The section of the *Mishna* referred to is *Sanhedrin* 4, 1. (The above translation is taken from the Eng-

Therefore, if the regulations of the *Mishna* were carried out in Our Lord's case, the Thursday tradition is automatically ruled out, since the trial would have required two days. It would also be in keeping with the Synoptics and the *Didascalia,* which record two sessions of the Sanhedrin.[46]

Of course, we are not in a position to prove conclusively that the Jews carried out the legal requirements set down in the *Mishna,* but Jaubert presents any number of reasons why it seems probable that they did.[47] She does not go along with the idea that the Jews were in a hurry to get the thing done. This is a prejudice we inherit from the Thursday tradition, where the lack of time forces us to say the Jews violated the legal fine points. But, if we forget the time element for a moment, there are indications that the opposite was the case. First we have the legalistic nature of the Jews to account for. St. John (18:28) seems to make it perfectly clear that it was still operative during Holy Week when they refused to enter the praetorium so as not to be defiled. Secondly, the Jews took full responsibility for the verdict: "His blood be upon us and upon our children . . ."; even though it was the Romans who executed the sentence.[48] Thirdly, it was necessary that Jesus be discredited as thoroughly as possible in order to destroy His following. This could only be accomplished by a full-scale trial with all the requirements rigorously adhered to. Fourth and last, Jaubert cites this argument to prove the *Mishna* was fulfilled to the letter: no Christian document of the early Church condemned the Jews on the grounds that there was something illegal in the way in which the trial was conducted.

To sum up the last section of Jaubert's presentation then, the great number of events recorded in the Gospels as having taken

---

lish translation of the *Mishna* by Robert Danby [London: Oxford University Press, 1933, 1st ed.], p. 387.)

[46] *Matt.* 26: 57 and 27: 1; *Mark* 14: 53 and 15: 1; Jaubert, *La date,* p. 142; *The Book,* p. 82.

[47] Jaubert, *La date,* pp. 162-3; *The Book,* pp. 123 ff.

[48] *Matt.* 27: 24-5. Jaubert shows how little regard the Jews had for things Roman by recalling the riots which took place in Jerusalem when Pilate allowed his soldiers to enter the city with the military standards and the figurines hateful to the Jews. They were regarded as idolatrous by the Jews. She refers to the account in Josephus: A.J. 18, 3, 1; and B.J. 2, 9, 2-3.

place from the time of the Last Supper until the crucifixion seems to make the Thursday tradition untenable. There just was not enough time to get everything in. If Mark is right (15:25), and Our Lord was crucified at nine in the morning on Friday, the Thursday tradition stands on even weaker ground. If, finally, there was a two-day trial, as the *Mishna* required for a capital offense, then it seems that the Thursday tradition has almost no ground on which to stand.

Before bringing the major portion of the work to a close, Jaubert discusses one final subject. Having established the fact that the calendar of *Jubilees* enables us to explain many difficulties, which seem insoluble without it, she asks if there is anything in the Gospel accounts which positively militates against the Tuesday tradition.[49] There does seem to be such a difficulty in the context of the denial of St. Peter. In all the accounts of the Evangelists the denial took place the night of the betrayal.[50] But, while Luke says it took place *before* the trial, Matthew and Mark seem to put the trial before the high priest in the *middle* of the denials, which would seem to show that the trial took place at night contrary to the requirements of the *Mishna.*

Jaubert does not try to use Luke against the other two Synoptics, but she believes that the elements of the solution seem to be contained in John's Gospel. At first this may not seem to be the case, since John mentions neither session of the Sanhedrin, only the interrogation before the high priest, the passage from Annas to Caiphas, and the hearing before Pilate.[51] The omission is so strange that most critics try to put verse 24 between verses 13 and 14, so that the denials and interrogation take place before Caiphas and not Annas. But for Jaubert this is an unnecessary and dubious solution. John simply describes the night of the arrest and Our Lord's appearance before Annas. The interrogation of Annas is not a trial. John saw no reason to include the latter, since it did not suit his purpose, so he left it out. Simply admitting this enables us to reconcile John and Luke, since both would then hold that Peter's denial preceded the trial. Luke mentions a particular moment when

---

[49] Jaubert, *La date,* pp. 164-7; *The Book,* pp. 121-2.

[50] *Matt.* 26:57 ff.; *Mark* 14:53 ff.; *Luke* 22:54 ff.; *John* 18:15

[51] *John* 18:12-28.

Our Lord turned and looked at Peter, which seems to be the same moment as John's passage from Annas to Caiphas.[52]

From what we have just said, it seems that John and Luke agree on the fact that the trial took place after Peter's denial and not during it. But we still have to deal directly with the order of events in Matthew and Mark. Are they reconcilable with John and Luke on this point, or must we leave the question unsolved and just say the Evangelists are evenly divided on the subject? Jaubert believes that we can detect a telescoping of events on the part of Matthew and Mark at this point, for John and Luke mention two high priests, Annas and Caiphas, while Matthew mentions only Caiphas, and Mark simply "The high priest."[53] It seems clear then that there is really no attempt on the part of Mark and Matthew to give us a strictly chronological order of events, so the holding of a night trial contrary to the regulations of the *Mishna* is not what they intend to tell us when they put it in conjunction with the denials of St. Peter. The problem is only an apparent one and presents no real difficulty to the hypothesis of the Tuesday tradition. We have only to consider the whole nature of Matthew's Gospel. It presents not a chronological but a logical order of events. And Mark's Gospel has been recognized ever since the time of Papias to be not especially noted for its order.[54]

Jaubert sums up on this point in this fashion: The difficulty of John's shortening of the order is only an apparent one since he obviously skips to Friday morning omitting the two sittings of the Sanhedrin. Luke, on the other hand, is favorable to a two-day trial, since he notes two meetings before Pilate and one with Herod. Mark has nothing against this, and Matthew has his own reasons for the extra time, namely that he interposes his account of Judas's repentance.[55]

---

[52] *Luke* 22:61 and *John* 18:24. In support of this explanation, Jaubert alleges Tatian's *Diatesseron,* Marmardji edition, "texte arabe étabili, traduit en français" (Beyrouth, 1935), p. 163; and P. Benoit, *Angelicum,* XX (1943), 158-60.

[53] *John* 18:13, 24. Luke does not mention any names at this point in the Passion, but we know from *Luke* 3:2 and *Acts* 4:6 that he knew of both Annas and Caiphas. In *Matt.* 26:57 Jaubert believes the name of Caiphas was inserted by the Greek redactor. Cf. also *Mark* 14:53.

[54] Huck, *op. cit.,* Introduction, p. vii.

[55] Jaubert, *La date,* p. 166; *The Book,* pp. 127-9.

A GENERAL SUMMARY

Mlle. Jaubert sums up what we have seen thus far.[56] To reverse the order, as far as the compatibility between the Calendar of *Jubilees* and the Gospels is concerned, we have seen a number of things. First, the events of Holy Week are best explained by the longer period of time that the Tuesday tradition would give us. Secondly, the hypothesis of a Tuesday celebration of the Last Supper would enable us to explain the date of the anointing at Bethany better. Finally, it solves the problem of eighteen centuries, how could the Last Supper really have been a paschal meal, if Our Lord died before the feast of the Pasch? All of these problems are explained by the hypothesis of the calendar of *Jubilees,* which had fallen into disuse in Our Lord's time, and into forgetfulness since then. Once the calendar had been lost sight of, if you held that Our Lord really ate a paschal meal, then it was necessary to have it take place as close to the legal Pasch of Friday as possible. Jaubert stresses the further point that the Evangelists were more interested in the reality behind the events, not so much in the chronology, a point which would make them all too easily pass over the awkwardness of perspective in their accounts. But their fidelity to the different traditions enables us to piece together out of their writings what actually seems to have taken place:

> It is understandable now why the allusions to a Last Supper on the eve of the crucifixion, are relatively late, and always linked up with some dispute involving exegesis, while the liturgy faithfully preserves the primitive formula: "The night on which He was betrayed." And [it is understandable] that tradition strenuously preserves the two ends of a chain whose connecting links are no longer visible: the Last Supper a paschal meal, and Jesus the Paschal Lamb.[57]

The ability of the calendar of *Jubilees* to fit in with the Gospels and to explain certain difficulties found there, together with the testimony of the *Didascalia,* Epiphanius and Victorinus, is in brief Jaubert's case for the Tuesday celebration of the Last Supper. It is a good case, and one that is carefully worked out in detail. The reservations I have made in the process of explaining her work are implicitly acknowledged by Mlle. Jaubert herself at the close of her article, where she observes that the work is still at the hypothesis stage and much still remains to be done. In closing I should like to say that Mlle. Jaubert is to be congratulated on even entering an area, let alone doing well in it, where the scarcity and complexity of documents have so intimidated a scholar like L. Duchesne, that he felt himself compelled to look around for a more attractive piece of ground to cultivate.[58]

---

[56] Jaubert, *La date,* pp. 167-8; *The Book,* pp. 129-36.

[57] Jaubert, *La date,* p. 168; *The Book,* p. 133.

Robert F. McDonald, S.J.

Woodstock College
Woodstock, Maryland

---

[58] L. Duchesne, *Origines du culte chrétien* (Paris: De Boccard, 1925), Preface, pp. ii-iii. The author did not completely abandon the field, but he believed that there were so few documents around that there seemed to be more room for conjecture than conclusion.

FRANCOIS MAURIAC AND THEOLOGY

The Stumbling Block by Francois Mauriac is a book of unconscious self-betrayal.[1] This outspoken critic of things ecclesiastical is indicted by his own anti-intellectualism, especially when he directs it toward theology. Since theology is the *"scientia fidei,"* the response of reason to faith, criticism of the Church to be legitimate must be based on sound theological principles. But, although the Vatican Council teaches that "reason is illumined by faith,"[2] Mauriac shows active antagonism to any scientific and systematic attempt at this enlightenment.

Early in his thin volume of complaint, Mauriac tells of "the affective character of my belief which is evident in the antipathy I feel for theology."[3] This surprising statement by an internationally known "Catholic writer" seems emotionally irresponsible. Actually, there is a gross misconception underlying it. After speaking of the atheistic rejection of God which is so common today, he adds sympathetically, "Understand me well: it does not astonish me that they cannot believe, since faith is irrational and, indeed, unbelievable."[4] Of course, on such an assumption, theology does become an absurdity, for any attempt of reason to respond to the irrational can only result in futility and frustration. Intelligibility is replaced by blind adherence. Faith no longer illumines reason and so, quite logically for Mauriac, "the behaviour of Catholics with respect to the truth they have received in trust is the only thing that matters."[5]

Mauriac's own "behaviour with respect to the truth" is amazingly inconsistent. Faith for him may be irrational, but it must on its peril conform to what he thinks it should be. He confesses naively, "I remember, in my youth, having replied to a priest who, in my presence was condemning to Hell all unbaptized humanity, that if he were speaking the truth, that if it were really the Church's doctrine, then I would renounce my faith at once."[6]

---

[1] Francois Mauriac, *The Stumbling Block,* N. Y.: The Philosophical Library, 1952.

[2] *Denz.,* 1796.

[3] Mauriac, *Ibid.,* p. vi.

[4] *Ibid.,* p. 6.

[5] *Ibid.,* p. 19.

His answer is akin to the "coach driver" theory in politics with its convenient principle that one should obey only oneself. The rationale is that the state is simply the servant of the voter and must do his will, nothing else. Yves Simon points out the crucial situation—one which Mauriac faces on the level of belief: "What am I to do the day I find myself in the minority? I may refuse to obey the law that I did not approve and declare myself a rebel; but then it will be clear that I have always been a rebel."[7] The logic of this conclusion is compelling and finds its application to Mauriac. "A conspicuous rebel as a member of a minority, I was already a rebel when I was a member of a unanimous assembly, since, even then, I was determined to disobey whenever I should happen to disagree."[8]

Mauriac insists that he is a faithful Catholic, "a Catholic who is convinced that the Church cannot be wrong in a matter of faith."[9] Yet he seemed ready to dismiss the Church as one would an unsatisfactory driver when "the truth," that is, "the Church's doctrine," appeared to lead him in a direction not to his liking. If behaviour is the standard by which he is to be judged, his position is, indeed, unfortunate.

One can only speculate whether that youthful spirit still persists, and what would happen if he realized that some of the statements he makes about what "every informed Christian knows" are not Catholic teaching at all. Notice how mistakenly he moves through the time hallowed fields of sacred doctrine.

> The preacher came to the formula *Extra Ecclesiam nulla salus,* "Outside the Church, no salvation"; every informed Christian knows that this means: "Outside the soul of the Church, there is no salvation." One can be part of the soul of the Church, without belonging to her body. The preacher was surely not unaware of this.[10]

---

[6] *Ibid.,* p. 25.

[7] Yves R. Simon, *The Philosophy of Democratic Government,* Illinois: The University of Chicago Press, 1951, p. 152.

[8] *Ibid.*

[9] Mauriac, *Ibid.,* p. v.

[10] *Ibid.,* p. 24.

Before accusing the preacher of ignorance or bad faith Mauriac should have considered the words, not of theologians this time but of Popes. Pius XII wrote: "This presence and activity of the Spirit of Jesus Christ is tersely and vigorously described by Our predecessor of immortal memory Leo XIII in his encyclical *Divinum illud* in these words: 'Let it suffice to say that, as Christ is the head of the Church, so is the Holy Spirit her soul.' "[11] No one, but no one, not even Mauriac is part of the Third Person of the Trinity.

Equally pertinent are the words of Pius XII in *Humani generis,* where he points out a current error: "Some reduce to a meaningless formula the necessity of belonging to the true Church in order to be saved."[12] Mauriac literally calls this dogma a "formula," and drastically minimizes it by stating that "every man who although unbaptized has followed the natural law will be saved."[13]

In 1949, the Holy Office sent a letter to Archbishop Cushing which spelled out in detail what theologians—if Mauriac could have overcome his bias sufficiently to consult them—could have told him years before, that to be saved one must belong to the Church *in re* or *in voto*. One who is not an actual member of the Church must belong to it at least by an implicit desire based on supernatural faith and perfected by supernatural charity. No doubt this is a "hard saying" for one who writes, "We believe His invisible flock to be infinitely more numerous than his visible flock, because it embraces all who remain outside the fold for fear of giving way, without the excuse of faith, to the attractiveness of consolation and comfort."[14] But faith is not an excuse, it is an absolute necessity, for "without faith it is impossible to please God."[15]

Mauriac refers to Simon Weil and her expression "purifying atheism."[16] He explains that "there is a kind of atheism that purifies the idea of God."[17] He speaks with deep respect of atheists as "these great souls that resist";[18] whereas he ridicules the

---

[11] Pius XII, *Mystici Corporis Christi, AAS,* XXXV (1943), 220.

[12] Pius XII, *Humani Generis, AAS,* XXXXII (1950), 571.

[13] Mauriac, *Ibid.,* p. 24.

[14] *Ibid.,* p. 59.

[15] *Heb.* 11:6.

[16] Mauriac, *Ibid.,* p. 59.

[17] *Ibid.*

[18] *Ibid.,* p. 58.

"mediocrity of the motives of the majority of Christians to repeat the formulas and bow to the disciplines of the Church."[19]

His own attitude toward the proof of God's existence from reason is preserved from heresy only by its ambiguity. He seems to reduce the basic truths in the preamble to faith to a mere guess.

> "Impossibility that God exists, impossibility that God does not exist." Both the one side and the other should recognize that in our inconsequences, as in the act of faith, we are even, and that we gamble alike for personal reasons which only our own kindred spirits find valid, that we are convinced by evidence which is not communicable to the adversary.[20]

Though Pius XII warned that "Others finally belittle the reasonable character of the credibility of Christian faith,"[21] Mauriac who is convinced that "faith is irrational and unbelievable" goes even further by placing himself in opposition to the defined dogma that human reason can prove the existence of God.[22] We Catholics do not guess, we are certain. We do not merely choose the safer course and gamble on the positive side of the impossibility instead of acting like "Nietzsche who gambles on the death of God."[23] Unless we acknowledge the absolute certitude of the dogma concerning the natural proof of God's existence, we lose our faith and our membership in the Mystical Body of Christ.

Of course any endeavor to prove this to Mauriac may defeat its purpose, just as attempts to calm a child's tantrum often only upset him all the more. He confesses:

> But it is not possible to be less of a theologian than I am, nor more persuaded of what Kierkegaard says, that God is not someone of

---

[19] *Ibid.*, p. 3.

[20] *Ibid.*, p. 7. Cf. Etienne Gilson in *God and Philosophy* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1941), p. 117: "Just as such personal experiences precede any attempt to prove that there is a God, they survive our failures to prove it. Pascal did not make much of the so-called proofs of God's existence. To him, it was incomprehensible that God should exist, and it was incomprehensible that God should not exist; then he would simply wager that God exist—a safe betting indeed, since there was much to gain and nothing to lose. Thus to bet is not to know, especially in a case when, if we lose, we cannot even hope to know it. Yet Pascal was still willing to bet on what he did not know."

[21] Pius XII, *Humani Generis, AAS*, XXXXII (1950), 571.

[22] *Denz*, 1806, 2195.

[23] Mauriac, *Ibid.*, p. 4.

> whom one speaks, but someone to whom one speaks. I do not say that boastingly; it is a fact that all theological reasoning quickly becomes a test of my faith, while it is nourished on the prayer of the mystics. As soon as one pretends to bring me proofs I lose ground.[24]

He insists that he is not opposed to "rational consciousness" nor does he favor a religion with "neither orthodoxy nor doctrine."[25] But how circumscribed is his understanding of these words as applied to the Catholic faith. For example, he declares that the traditional means of educating youth in the faith results in this, that the dramatic doctrine, the Christian affirmation "has been put into pills by theologians all over the world and forced down the throats of the children of the catechism, who immediately vomit it up."[26] But if only things were different. "Oh! how avidly I would listen to them, if they spoke to me of the son of man, not as theologians, not as sociologists, but as those who see, who touch the resurrected Christ."[27] He is rather demanding on those who, as St. Paul tells us, "see now darkly as through a glass, but then face to face."[28]

Mauriac's fundamental problem may be psychological rather than theological, as he himself seems to suspect. For example, he has toward our Holy Mother the Church "an irritated veneration"[29] which he attributes to parental influences, to "my irreligious father and my passionately Catholic mother."[30] He explains how he has been conditioned: "I have always discerned in myself a perceptible taste for, a tender inclination towards everything my father opposed and on occasion sudden rages against everything my mother held in veneration."[31]

Surely one with the prying psychological insight evinced by Mauriac in his many novels should realize the immaturity of an emotional life which directs towards the Church "a critical spirit without complaisance . . . a lucidity which sometimes resembles hostility."[32] His very subjectivity cries out for the calm and sober reasonableness of theology; for by his own writings he has shown that "the stumbling block" is not the true and visible Church, but its confused son, Francois Mauriac.

---

[24] *Ibid.*, p. 64.

[25] *Ibid.*, p. 65.

[26] *Ibid.*, p. 4.

[27] *Ibid.*, p. 67.

[28] *I Cor.*, 13: 12.

[29] Mauriac, *Ibid.*, p. 31.

[30] *Ibid.*, p. 32.

[31] *Ibid.*

DAVID GRANFIELD, O.S.B.

St. Anselm's Priory
Washington, D. C.

---

[32] *Ibid.*, p. 47.

THE DECREES OF THE BIBLICAL COMMISSION

An article was published a few years ago by the Secretary[1] and Sub-secretary[2] of the Biblical Commission to introduce the second revised edition of the *Enchiridion Biblicum.*[3] It contains an important clarification of the binding force of the Commission's decrees. Naturally, it has already received considerable space in the biblical periodicals,[4] but the decrees are of importance to others besides those directly involved in biblical studies. In theological manuals, apologetics textbooks, and religious instruction courses the decrees are referred to repeatedly. For that reason, the article merits some additional comment here.

The article deals with the importance of the documents published in the new edition of the *Enchiridion.* It emphasizes their importance from the point of view of the history of dogma, and from the point of view of apologetics.

From the point of view of apologetics the documents are of importance because they show how the Church has always been the guardian of revealed truth, how she defends the sanctity of the Scriptures and promotes their correct interpretation. In this connection particular reference is made to the Encyclicals *Providentissimus Deus* and *Divino Afflante Spiritu* as outstanding examples of the Church's guidance in fruitful interpretation of God's word.

From the point of view of the history of dogma the documents are of importance both positively and negatively. Positively, they show how the Scriptures have been the source of Catholic dogma and of its continual development. Negatively, they show how the Church has guided that development in its continual struggle in defense of the truth of the sacred text. In this connection the Biblical Commission's decrees are referred to as concrete examples of the Church's defense of the inspired books against the errors of the day.

---

[1] A. M(iller), "Das neue biblische Handbuch," *Benediktinische Monatschrift* 31 (1955), 49-50.

[2] A. Kleinhans, "De nova Enchiridii Biblici editione," *Antonianum* 30 (1955), 63-65. The article, published simultaneously in two periodicals, appeared in both German and Latin; a fact which indicates the importance the authors attach to its content. It is *not* an official publication.

[3] *Enchiridion Biblicum. Documenta ecclesiastica Sacram Scripturam spectantia auctoritate Pontificiae Commissionis de re biblica edita,* editio secunda aucta et recognita (Neapoli et Romae, 1954).

[4] E. Siegman, "The Decrees of the Pontifical Biblical Commission," *CBQ* 18 (1956), 23-29, who gives both the German and Latin text of the article, as well as an English translation. J. Dupont, "A propos du nouvel Enchiridion Biblicum," *RB* 62 (1955), 414-419. E. Vogt, "De decretis Commissionis Biblicae distinguendis," *Bb* 36 (1955), 564-565. A. M. Dubarle, *ZAW* 66 (1954), 149.

Speaking of the decrees, the article continues:

> However, in so far as views are expressed in these decrees which are not connected with truths of faith and morals, either immediately or mediately, it is evident that the exegete can in all liberty pursue his research and utilize its results—subject always to the teaching power of the Church.

This principle is not, of course, new. That Catholics are perfectly free in purely scientific matters connected with the sacred books had already been clearly stated in *Divino Afflante Spiritu:*

> Let them (i.e. all Catholics) bear in mind above all that in the rules and laws promulgated by the Church there is question of doctrines regarding faith and morals; and that . . . there remain, therefore, many things and of the greatest importance, in the discussion and exposition of which the skill and genius of Catholic commentators may and ought to be freely exercised.[5]

For instance, the Catholic scholar is free to defend scientific theories concerning the origin of the material universe and the human body which, in the judgment of the Church, do not conflict with the truths of revealed religion. The nature and extent of that freedom is made abundantly clear in the Church's condemnation of recent forms of the scientific theory of polygenism: they conflict with truths involved in the doctrine of original sin.

But what is of special interest in this discussion is the fact that the Biblical Commission's decrees do to some extent express views on purely scientific matters, i.e., matters which are not connected either mediately or immediately with truths of faith or morals. This means that there has been an important change in connection with the decrees, for they were not published to decide purely scientific matters, but scientific matters which had a connection with truths of religion, since "in the rules and laws promulgated by the Church there is question of doctrines regarding faith and morals."[6]

---

[5] *AAS* 35 (1943), 319.

The nature of that change consists in the fact that the scientific matters which formerly had a connection with doctrines of faith, and which accordingly were ruled on by the Commission, now no longer have that same connection, and so have become purely scientific matters in which the Catholic exegete, under the direction of the Church, enjoys full liberty.

This change in circumstances, which has resulted in a modification of the normative value of the Commission's early decrees, is described in the article as follows:

> Nowadays we can hardly appreciate the situation in which Catholic scholars found themselves at the turn of the century, nor the danger in which Catholic teaching on Scripture and its inspiration was involved, at a time when the restraints of sacred tradition were in danger of being swept away by a flood of liberal and rationalistic criticism. Today, because the battle has substantially abated, and because not a few controversies have been peacefully settled and many problems appear in a completely new light, it is all too easy to deride the "restraint" and "narrowness" prevailing then.

At "the turn of the century" the Catholic exegete was dealing with an entirely different set of problems. The Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, the authorship of the Psalms, the date of the Synoptic gospels, in fact, all the problems of special introduction to the OT and NT, were vital questions because they were closely connected with matters of faith, e.g., with the inspiration and historical validity of the sacred books. From that point of view, the Biblical Commission's replies gave the norms for prudent treatment of those scientific questions. Today, the same questions no longer have the connection they once had with matters of faith. The inspiration of the Pentateuch does not depend on its authorship, the prophetic character of the book of Isaias does not depend on the date of its final composition, etc. These are the "many problems which now appear in a completely new light."

Therefore, before reference can be made to the Biblical Commission's decrees, it must be determined whether they express the discipline of the Church now as they did in the early 1900's. If the scientific matters with which they deal no longer retain their earlier connection with matters of faith, the decrees are no longer applicable, for they were answers to the question under an entirely different aspect. Some of them, in consequence, will have lost their original normative value. All of them, however, retain that value for the history of dogma and apologetics to which the article refers; for that reason, all of them were republished in the second edition of the Enchiridion.

---

[6] Cf. *DAS,* quoted above.

EAMONN O'DOHERTY

St. Columban's Seminary
Milton, Mass.

UNITY AND PEACE

In his Christmas message Our Holy Father Pope John XXIII paid this magnificent tribute to his great predecessor in the Roman Pontificate: "For one wishing to sum up in two comprehensive words the living substance of this teaching contained in the nineteen Christmas messages and the twenty volumes of the rich collection of the written and spoken words of Pius XII, it is enough to utter these words: unity and peace."[1]

Pope John's assessment of Pope Pius XII's published *Acta* was perfectly objective. During his long and brilliant reign as the Vicar of Christ on earth, the late Sovereign Pontiff had taught and worked unceasingly for the unity and the peace that Our Lord described and desired. And, in the last analysis, his labors for the Church were most eminently successful precisely because his literary monument stands revealed as one organized labor for the very benefits which Our Lord and His Mystical Body sought and continue to seek among men.

The text of Our Lord's sacerdotal prayer, written in the Gospel according to St. John, shows us very clearly what our Lord taught on the subject of unity among His followers. Our Lord prayed to His Father for the benefit of His original disciples: "Holy Father, keep them in thy name whom thou hast given me: that they may be one, as we also are."[2] And, for those who were going to believe in Him through the preaching of this original company of the disciples, he petitioned:

> That they all may be one, as thou, Father, in me, and I in thee; that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that thou hast sent me.
>
> And the glory which thou hast given me, I have given to them: that they may be one, as we also are one.
>
> I in them, and thou in me: that they may be made perfect in one: and the world may know that thou hast sent me and hast loved them, as thou hast also loved me.[3]

---

[1] *AER,* CXL, 2 (Feb., 1959).

[2] *John,* 17: 11.

[3] *John,* 17: 21 ff.

In this most beautiful passage in all of Sacred Scripture, the unity of God's people within His supernatural kingdom of the New Testament is manifested as the great and primary favor Our Lord sought from His Father for the children of men. It is in this unity of faith and of charity that God's glory is to be attained in this world.

In His discourse to the Apostles after the Last Supper Our Lord spoke of His peace, His gift to His followers. "Peace I leave with you: my peace I give unto you: not as the world giveth, do I give unto you. Let not your heart be troubled: nor let it be afraid."[4]

Peace is the gift of Christ. Ultimately that peace is to be found in Our Lord himself. As St. Paul says:

> But now in Christ Jesus, you, who some time were afar off, are made nigh by the blood of Christ.
>
> For he is our peace, who hath made both one, and breaking down the middle wall of partition, the enmities in his flesh:
>
> Making void the law of commandments contained in decrees: that he might make the two in himself into one new man, making peace.
>
> And might reconcile both to God in one body by the cross, killing the enmities in himself.
>
> And coming, he preached peace to you that were afar off: and peace to them that were nigh.[5]

And ultimately it was the hope and the command of St. Paul that the disciples confided to his rule might be "careful to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace."[6]

The first petition of the Canon of the Mass according to the Roman rite is a prayer that God should receive and bless our gifts and sacrifices which "first of all we offer" to Him, begging Him "to give it peace, to guard it, to unite it, and to rule it throughout the world." And the first of the three prayers which the celebrant says before the communion reads:

> O Lord Jesus Christ, who has said to Thy Apostles: "Peace I leave with you: My peace I give unto you": look not upon my sins, but upon the faith of Thy Church, and deign to give it peace and unity according to Thy will.

---

[4] *John*, 14:27.
[5] *Eph.*, 2:13-17.
[6] *Eph.*, 4:3.

Peace and unity were the great gifts won by Our Lord and granted by Him to His Mystical Body. Any man is successful in the service of Christ to the extent to which his efforts have been expended in procuring the peace and unity of Christ for His Church. Thus the statement by Pope John to the effect that the teaching of his predecessor on the papal throne could be summed up under the heading of unity and peace constitutes the highest praise for the works of Pope Pius XII.

In these words of the Sovereign Pontiff there is a lesson of tremendous import for all of us who are called upon to participate in the teaching mission of the Catholic Church. It should be our constant prayer that, when our course is finished, it may truly be said that whatever we have preached or written may be summed up under the headings of the unity and the peace of Christ in the Kingdom of God.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

Answers to Questions

DEFECTIVE HOST

Question: It happened recently that, as I picked up the large host at the *"Qui pridie,"* an awkward motion of my right hand broke off a sizable portion of the host. What procedure should I have followed? I feel I handled the situation correctly but I am looking for further assurance.

Answer: You should have placed the parts of the broken host off the corporal, mentally excluding them from consecration. You would then have a fresh host brought to you, make a mental offering of it without holding it up, and begin again at the *"Qui pridie."* If the accident had occurred before the *"Qui pridie,"* you would have resumed the prayers at the point of interruption. After your Communion, you should have consumed the parts of the discarded host as deserving of reverence because the host had been offered at the Offertory. Cf. J. B. O'Connell, *The Celebration of Mass,* Chapter XI.

LIFTING THE CHASUBLE

Question: Is there any legislation requiring the server to lift the chasuble somewhat when the celebrant genuflects after the consecration of each species? Is this not a custom that has outgrown its usefulness?

Answer: The *Ritus servandus in celebratione Missae,* which may be called the official rule book for the ceremonies of the Mass, directs the server to lift the lower edge of the chasuble to relieve the tension when the arms are elevated after each consecration (*Ritus* VIII, 6). This action may indeed seem to many to be useless, especially if the chasuble happens to be the skimpy fiddleback style, but the direction remains in the *Ritus* and should be observed. It does serve some purpose when ample vestments are worn.

COVERING THE CIBORIUM

Question: At what point during the actions connected with the elevation should the celebrant replace the cover on the ciborium containing Hosts just consecrated? There seems to be no uniformity of practice. Is anything prescribed?

Answer: Our good old stand-by, the *Ritus servandus in celebratione Missae,* which seems too little known, directs the celebrant to replace the cover *after* the genuflection which follows the elevation of the Host (VIII, 6).

MINOR MINISTERS

Question: Should the biretta be tipped to any and all ministers of the Mass who bow to the choir or is this reverence to be confined to the major ministers?

Answer: Although there seems to be no decree on this point, the weight of authority among rubricians is in favor of confining this reverence to the major ministers, i.e. those clad in vestments (in practice, the deacon and subdeacon).

THE BELL AT MASS

Question: When, precisely, is the bell to be rung at Mass? I am wondering especially about the custom of ringing it at the first "*Domine, non sum dignus*" and also when the priest repeats these words immediately before the distribution of Holy Communion.

Answer: The *Ritus* mentions only two occasions: at the *"Sanctus,"* when it says that "the server meanwhile rings a small bell" (VII, 8); and at the elevations, when it directs the server to ring the bell "three times at each elevation, or continuously until the priest places the Host on the corporal, and likewise later for the elevation of the Chalice" (VIII, 6). Martinucci also confines the ringing of the bell to these two occasions, but he calls for "three distinct double tinkles" at the *"Sanctus."* At the elevations he prescribes three doubles for each or the continuous ringing at each elevation. On the strength of *SRC* 4377 a single ringing of the bell is considered permissible at the *"Hanc igitur"* where it is the custom, as it certainly is in this country. J. B. O'Connell, in *The Celebration of Mass,* adds a triple ring at the first *"Domine, non sum dignus,"* "if customary" (and, again, it surely is in this country). Some follow the custom of omitting the ringing of the bell at this time if there is to be no distribution of Holy Communion. There is no authority and no reason for ringing the bell at the *"Domine, non sum dignus"* immediately before the distribution of Communion.

Dom Matthew Britt, in his helpful little book, *How to Serve,* lists the following times when the bell should not be rung: "The bell must not be rung during a Low Mass while a High Mass is being sung in the same church. Nor may it be rung even on Sundays either at the altar of exposition or at any other altar in the church during the time the Blessed Sacrament is exposed, as during the Forty Hours' Adoration. Moreover, it should not be rung at a side altar while a wedding or a funeral is taking place. Nor is it rung while the Office is being recited in choir, nor while the celebrant and sacred ministers are on the way to the altar for a Solemn High Mass, or are returning to the sacristy after it, nor, finally, while a procession is in progress in the church" (p. 39).

THE NUPTIAL BLESSING

Question: The non-Catholic party in a mixed marriage has just recently come into the Church and the couple are now desirous of receiving the nuptial blessing. What procedure is to be followed?

Answer: The nuptial blessing must be given to them within a Mass, for only by Apostolic indult may it be bestowed outside Mass; even when there is such an indult, a formulary different from the one found in the Mass *pro Sponso et Sponsa* is to be used. If the day you agree on for the ceremony happens to be one on which the Mass *pro Sponso et Sponsa* may not be said, then the Mass will be that of the day, with a commemoration of the *Missa pro Sponso et Sponsa* under one conclusion, and with the interpolation of the formularies of blessing in their accustomed place. The priest who offers the Mass and who therefore gives the nuptial blessing must have the permission of the proper pastor or the Ordinary.

JOHN P. MCCORMICK, S.S.

PUNISHMENT OF WAR CRIMINALS

Question: What is to be said of the procedure which has come into vogue in recent years, whereby the government or party that has won a war inflicts punishment—even death—on some of the leaders of the conquered? This procedure on the part of General Castro in Cuba has aroused great indignation throughout our country lately.

Answer: Regarding the particular case mentioned by the questioner it is very difficult to obtain adequate and reliable information. For example, *Time* for January 19, 1959, asserts that some officials of the previous government in Cuba have been killed without benefit of trial, whereas one of the members of Congress stated (January 15) that he found no proof that anyone had been executed without a fair trial. Hence, in answering this question we must confine ourselves to principles.

First, to punish the vanquished leaders merely because they fought for their side would be a return to the barbarism of the ancient days. Those who have lost a war should be regarded as having been sincere in fighting for their cause, and should be given their freedom as long as they assure the conquerors that they will not resume the war. At most, a conquered leader could be punished if it was proved that he had started a definitely unjust war.

Second, if some of the vanquished, in addition to having inaugurated or waged a war, are proved guilty of having committed crimes, such as killing or torturing helpless prisoners, they can be punished, even with death, by the victorious government or party. However, this should not be done until these persons have received a fair trial. To kill any of the conquered, even when it is certain that they have committed heinous crimes, before they have had an opportunity to explain and defend their conduct before a legitimately established court, is murder.

In this matter those who have won a war should be most lenient, because in time of war the combatants may perform criminal acts, deserving of severe punishment, and yet be excused from subjective guilt because of the excitement and emotional stress to which they were subjected. On this score I believe that the prudence of the Allied governments in putting to death the Nazi leaders after World War II can be questioned, even though they received a fair trial. This procedure certainly established a pattern that could easily lead to inhuman abuses in future wars. It is worth noting that General Castro has defended the executions inflicted by his government on officials of the previous regime by citing the conduct of the Allied government in respect to the Nazi leaders.

MEDICAL EXPERIMENTATION ON CONDEMNED CRIMINALS

Question: What is to be said of the suggestion recently made by a speaker at a scientific convention, that prisoners condemned to death be allowed to offer themselves as subjects for medical experimentation that will eventually kill them?

Answer: No Catholic can doubt that the sovereign civil authority possesses the right to inflict capital punishment on persons convicted of a grave crime. The Church has never opposed such a penalty, lawfully inflicted, but on the contrary has condemned those who denied such a right on the part of the civil government. Thus, in the profession of faith required from the Waldensians of the thirteenth century as a condition for admission to Catholic communion the statement occurs: "In regard to the secular power we assert that it can impose capital punishment (*judicium sanguinis exercere*), provided it proceeds without hatred, etc." (*DB,* 425). Luther's doctrine that heretics may not be punished by death was also condemned (*DB,* 773). More recently, in a discourse to a convention of histopathologists, held in Rome in 1952, Pope Pius XII, in explaining this matter, asserted: "Even when there is question of a person condemned to death, the State does not take away the ***right*** of the individual to life. It is then reserved to the public authority to deprive the condemned person of the ***benefit*** of life in expiation for his guilt, after he himself, by his crime, has already deprived himself of his right to life" (*AAS,* XLIV [1952], 787).

However, Catholics are free to discuss the question whether or not capital punishment is feasible and effective as a preventive of crime. Indeed, there are Catholics on both sides of this controversy.

Furthermore, the government has the right to determine the particular method of inflicting capital punishment. In former centuries very painful methods were sometimes employed, such as burning at the stake; and although civilized nations have now commendably abandoned such types of execution and consider it the proper course to dispatch the criminal quickly and mercifully, we cannot say that the former procedures were absolutely opposed to the law of God. It may be that they provided an effective deterrent from crime for many persons.

From this it follows that *per se* the State has the right to execute a condemned person by making him the subject of medical experimentation that would eventually bring about death. We say that *per se* the State possesses this right, because *per accidens,* on account of the abuses which would almost inevitably follow, it would seem that such discretionary power would have to be denied to the State. In discussing this matter, Dr. John Shinners of the Catholic University of America, wrote as follows:

> It seems that the public authority, if the question be considered in the abstract, has the right to establish that subjection to dangerous experiments be all or part of a sanction for serious crime. In this situation the court would sentence the criminal to be used in experimental work. In strict justice, just as the public authority has the right to condemn a criminal to death for serious crimes (and sometimes does), or has the right to condemn a criminal to be mutilated, so it has the right to condemn a person convicted of a serious crime to be the subject of experiments. However, it does not seem that this should be done in practice, even though in the abstract the state has the right to do so. It seems to come into the same category as mutilation or torture as a punishment, which, although legitimate, should not be used inasmuch as they breed contempt for the human person, which easily leads to abuses. The Nazi concentration camps give evidence of this. Thus, the conclusion would be that even though public authority has the right to condemn criminals to be subjects of experiments as all or part of their punishment, in practice it should not be permitted because of the grave evils and dangers connected with it (*The Morality of Medical Experimentation on Living Human Subjects,* by the Rev. John J. Shinners [Catholic University of America Press, 1958], pp. 21-22).

But what must be said on this problem if the condemned criminal freely consents or even requests that the death sentence be carried out in the form of medical experimentation, so that eventually the subjects would die from the experiments or would be put to death by an excessive dose of anaesthetics? It was this form of execution that was advocated by Dr. Kevorkian, of Pontiac, Michigan, at a convention of scientists held in Washington in December, 1958. Certainly, considering the problem in the abstract, such a procedure would be *permissible,* since the State possesses the right to execute a criminal in this way even against his wishes.

But may the State apply in practice this power which it possesses in the abstract?A writer in *l'Ami du Clergé* for Sept. 25, 1947 (p.

679) says that there are conflicting views on the subject, though it is his own view that this is not permissible because it is not becoming to ask them to do this for a society from which they have already been radically separated. Commenting on this article in *Theological Studies* for 1948 (p. 90), Fr. Gerald Kelly, S.J., regards this argument as exaggerated, since the separation of the criminal from society has not broken the bond of human nature. Fr. Kelly's own opinion is that if the experimentation is permissible at all, it seems that it would be praiseworthy for the condemned criminals to offer themselves, and quite becoming for society to accept the offer.

While fully admitting Fr. Kelly's view in theory, I would definitely oppose any attempt to introduce lethal experimentation by the civil government as a form of execution. For, I fear that it would lead to abuses similar to those mentioned by Fr. Shinners. Dr. Kevorkian has incorporated into his suggested plan many measures to prevent abuses--the presence of legal representatives during the process of experimentation, the assurance of complete anaesthesia, the unqualified consent of the criminal, etc. But, once the method of execution has been legalized, what assurance have we that these safeguards would not be neglected? It has so often happened that some legalized measure which in the beginning was surrounded by protective procedures proved to be an opening wedge to grave abuses. Is it not possible that if voluntary experimentation were permitted for the carrying out of a death sentence, compulsory experimentation would eventually be introduced? And perhaps those convicted of lesser crimes would be obliged to undergo experimentation which would be painful, though not necessarily lethal. Might not the requirement of complete anaesthesia be sometimes neglected? And what of the spirit of sadism that might easily be induced in these making the experiments, and the danger that they would soon place human subjects in the same category as animals? For reasons such as these I believe that the proposal made by Dr. Kevorkian should be rejected.

THE EXTENT OF TEMPORARY FACULTIES

Question: When a priest goes into another diocese for weekend work in one of the parish churches, how extensive are the faculties for confessions that he receives from the Bishop? Could he use them in any other part of the diocese besides the parish where he is rendering service? Would he possess these faculties in the parish or diocese at other times outside of weekends—for example, if he visited the parish or diocese in the course of the week and was requested to hear confessions?

Answer: This is a matter which depends entirely on the intention of the one who deputes the visiting priest to hear confessions—ordinarily the bishop, the vicar general or the chancellor. If he wishes he can limit the visitor's power of absolution to a single parish and to the time of the weekend work; on the other hand, if he so wills he can intend to extend the faculities so that they can be exercised throughout the entire diocese and even between weekends. It must be admitted that sometimes the delegation is expressed in such a manner that it is uncertain how extensive the faculties are intended to be. I believe that if the expression "faculties of the diocese" is used, it can be reasonably presumed that they can be used in any church of the diocese, not merely the one to which the priest intends to go. (This can be a practical point when there is question of a last-minute shift in weekend assignments to two priests within the same diocese).

When there is question of the use of the faculties between weekends, I believe that a distinction must be made. When a different priest goes to the parish each week, as can happen when the members of a religious community give regular weekend service in another diocese, I believe that the intention of the one giving the faculties is to limit their exercise to the weekend. If, however, the same priest goes regularly to the same parish, it may well be that he receives habitual faculties in the diocese (for a definite period, as six months or a year) which he could use within that diocese at any time.

The practical conclusion is that those who delegate visiting priests to hear confessions should be most definite as to the limits of time and place within which these faculties may be exercised.

Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R.

Book Reviews

TOWARDS A NEW WORLD. By Riccardo Lombardi, S.J. Translated and condensed from the Italian. New York: Philosophical Library Publishers, 1958. Pp. xvi + 276. $6.00.

Six years have passed since this book first appeared in its Italian edition. Herein Father Lombardi presents to the English-reading world his thesis that in our generation mankind is disposed as never before to accept the teaching of the Gospels. Together with this is his practical program for effecting this acceptance, and for thus building a "Better World."

His thesis is brilliantly developed in the first one hundred pages. Ours is a generation of collapse. Already trembling from the horrors we have lived through, we are frozen in the fear of savage armaments which can shake the very powers of the universe. The mighty theistic synthesis which found its supreme expression in St. Thomas and Dante has been followed by five centuries of mean and pitiful humanism. This humanism began by emphasizing the importance of this world, gradually minimized the importance of the Divine and culminated in Nietzsche's blasphemous cry, "God is dead." Decadent speculation can now go no further and subsequent expansion is in a lateral direction. The world plunging headlong into apostasy has brought upon itself the degradation of concentration camps, racial extermination, and a gruesome, godless political world which is a veritable jungle. Out of all this there has grown the conviction of human limitation.

The lesson of history is that humanism has exhausted itself in miserable failure. The mood of our generation is one of frustration and complete defeat of the human spirit. And so our generation in its ruin and ashes is prepared for the return of God. Since we are heirs of a long humanistic tradition, our generation is intensely concerned with earthly interests. It is precisely these earthly interests of the masses which are in dire need of the principles of the Gospel, and thus the soil is prepared for an unprecedented christianization of the world. It is the Gospel which men are seeking without knowing it. Having tried all else, mankind after five shameful centuries is at last exhausted; and, like the prodigal son wallowing among swine, is ready to return to its Father's house.

However it should not be thought that Christianity is now appealing only to earthly self-interest, that it will henceforth present itself merely as man's only source of earthly happiness. Grace will effect conversions to the Church in the future as it has in the past. The doctrines of the Church are primarily spiritual, but their honest acceptance brings much worldly justice, charity, truth, peace, and happiness. This is what the world is immediately seeking; and modern men, finding their aspirations satisfied in the honest, simple implementation of the Gospel, will be led to full acceptance of the Church's message. But this age will not be the millennium. Communism will have perhaps a long and poisonous decadence; non-Christian religions, even non-Catholic sects will resist the Church; there may well be disloyalties and perfidy among the ministers of the Church. However it is not the exclusion of all these which mark the "Age of the Saviour," but rather the fact that mankind is now seeking and will continue to seek Christianity as an ideology to solve its earthly problem. The struggle will be fierce; but in turning to the Church, mankind will find not only the earthly peace it seeks, but the eternal salvation it has forgotten. Thus for Lombardi the present ruin of our world and the inherent appeal of the teaching of the Church establish the compelling probability of the proximate advent of the "Age of the Saviour."

Father Lombardi devotes the second part of his book to techniques, and for him one fact is startlingly evident. The Church, in all her long history, has perhaps never been more richly endowed with sanctity and learning, from the pinnacle of the papacy down to the individual cleric and layman. Yet this magnificent instrument, operating in a favorable milieu, is not accomplishing its purpose. There is an astonishing disparity between the perfection of the instrument and the results. For Lombardi this indicates an urgent need for greater efficiency, in order to make the "Age of the Saviour" a reality.

However more efficient organization is not the sole solution; to this there must be added a spiritual renewal which will quicken all the members of the Mystical Body. The practical program for a better world consists in the development of these two principles. The spiritual renewal holds the place of primacy. The Church needs new men, less individualistic, less self-centered, more obedient to authority. All traces of jealousy must be erased. No one must work in isolation; neither lay worker, religious, pastor nor even Bishop is a world unto himself. Neither mental nor practical insubordination to legitimate authority can be of any service in this Christian renewal. The Church alone has the mission from Christ; and unless one labors in perfect harmony and subordination to the lawful rulers, he labors in vain. Lombardi insists upon this over and over again; not without reason in a generation which has seen individual Catholics, in an imprudent zeal, presume to dictate to the Church in matters of belief and policy.

The greatest portion of the book, however, is given to a consideration of practical suggestions towards the formation of a more efficient organization in Church affairs. These suggestions pass through a series of concentric circles, beginning with the supreme government, passing through Religious Institutes, nations, dioceses, parishes, family and the individual. The suggestions are myriad and breathtaking. What is adaptable to all levels is a three-stage plan: first, a careful official report of the situation; then an enquiry into the complexity of the forces available; finally an organic plan of action. The diocese and the parish in particular must develop a richer consciousness of their place in the Mystical Body. The Church is not merely a union of dioceses and parishes. It is an organic body and each unit within the organism must live that same life, each sharing in the mentality of the supreme head.

In all of this there must be no contempt for what has been done by others; there is no thought of adding another organization, or of supressing existing ones. What is vital is that all existing activities be co-ordinated, stripped of petty jealousies and competitive spirit and, above all, be placed absolutely under the direction and guidance of the lawful authorities. How sad it is to see Catholics working against one another; even sometimes the Catholic clergy, divided along diocesan and religious lines. How shameful when such an attitude is positively fostered by institutions training the clergy of tomorrow! In the name of Jesus whose priesthood we all share, this must end if the "Age of the Saviour" is ever to become a reality.

This book cannot be recommended too highly especially to priests, seminarians and active lay Catholics. It has the merit of harnessing all available Catholic energies; it effectively reduces to action the sublime doctrine of the Mystical Body. Though we have here described Father Lombardi's thesis more than his practical suggestions, there is no lack of the latter. Whatever one's position, he will find pertinent practical advice here. Yet all of this seems secondary to Father Lombardi's thinking. He readily admits the possibility of disagreement on the practical level. Yet he defends his thesis vigorously. And with cause. His plan is not merely the personal thesis of an Italian preacher but a powerful attempt to promote a more efficient Catholicism. Ten thousand priests have followed his course of exercises at the center of the "Better World Movement." Many bishops have done likewise. Cardinal Roncalli was the only Italian Cardinal to make the course of exercises. At the Villa Mondragone in Frascati in August of 1956, he followed the course along with the entire Venetian Episcopate which he had gathered together for a week for this purpose. He has subsequently sent many communications of encouragement and support to Father

Lombardi, the last being dated October 31, 1958, three days after his election to the Papacy. Thus it would come as no surprise if the same strong support were given by Pope John XXIII to the "Better World Movement" as that supplied by his saintly predecessor.

JOHN KING, O.M.I.

BASIL ANTHONY MARY MOREAU. By Canon Etienne Catta and Tony Catta. Translated by Edward L. Heston, C.S.C. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1955. Vol. 1: pp. xxix + 1016; Vol. 2; pp. 1108. $30.

In its early years the Congregation of Holy Cross, whose priests, brothers, and sisters are engaged in various phases of the apostolate throughout the world, was exposed to numerous serious trials. A principal character in all these trials was its Founder, Father Basil Moreau. Endowed with a deep spirituality, a fiery temper, a knack for organization, intense enthusiasm, and a certain amount of unwordly imprudence, Father Moreau suffered greatly in founding and in governing his new community of priests and brothers. Always obedient to Rome, he complied with the request that his sisters be placed under a separate administration. Out of the misunderstandings and intrigues which led to his resignation as Superior-General came a loss of his reputation and bitterness among some members of the community. Previous studies of the disputes and clashes which filled the latter half of his life have been mostly superficial or apologetic, and rather unsatisfactory. The present book, undertaken at the request of the community, is an attempt to clear the air, set the record straight, and present once and for all, what is true about Father Moreau, whether it be favorable or not. The work is a definite success.

The authors, Canon Catta, professor of Roman and Byzantine history at the Catholic University of Angers, and his brother, an attorney, have written what they feel is a trial by history. As in any trial, the documentation is extensive. The translation from the French is done by the Procurator General of Holy Cross, Father Edward Heston, C.S.C., who is well-experienced as a translator and known for his recent *The Holy See at Work* among other books.

The first of two volumes, each over a thousand pages in length, covers the foundation of the community and its expansion into the United States, Canada, Algeria, and Bengal. It is not long before the reader is introduced to the first of many intrigues which make this lengthy study surprisingly interesting. Father Moreau's misunderstanding with the holy nun, Saint Mary Euphrasia Pelletier, is made more intelligible by the account of the part played by an Abbé Perché. As a contribution to the literature on the subject the authors hold that Perché's winning the confidence of the Good Shepherd nuns to the virtual exclusion of confidence in Father Moreau, their rightful supperior at the time, explains the tension between the Saint and the Founder of Holy Cross.

In obtaining approval for his own community Father Moreau ran into a formidable obstacle in Bishop Bouvier of Le Mans. The Father Founder's intense zeal, his inflexibility and lack of diplomatic niceties, together with the ordinary difficulties of any new organization, were some of the reasons leading the Gallican Bishop to withdraw his support. In addition, Father Moreau's great allegiance to Rome and his appeals to the Holy See at a time when France was Gallican did not help matters. It was without Bouvier's consent that the community at last received definitive papal approbation in 1857.

The first volume ends on a note of sorrow, the split between the mother house in France and the American members of the community who had established themselves in Indiana. The disputes reach a peak and continue in the second volume. Almost from the beginning in the 1830's the community sent out missionaries, and the men at Notre Dame du Lac (now the University of Notre Dame) quickly became part of the pre-Civil War American scene. In a country where emancipation was the burning issue of the day, they tended more and more toward independence. In the opinion of a representative of Father Moreau sent from France, these men, led by Father Edward Sorin, C.S.C., were firmly convinced that the mother house was seriously holding back their progress. The situation deteriorated to such an extent that they sought from the Bishop of the American Diocese of Vincennes a dispensation from obedience to Father Moreau. The authors claim the alleged causes were minor and insufficient, the real cause being the success of Holy Cross in America, and the desire of Sorin for an absolutely free hand. However, at the time, canon law was vague and incomplete on many points bearing on the case. The fact that the Congregation was not yet officially approved by Rome, that other European communities were severing ties with the motherland, and that part of the American hierarchy favored such an approach, together with the fact that the Bishop had granted the dispensation, apparently gave Sorin sufficient freedom, at least in his own mind. From the viewpoint of religious obedience to Father Moreau many of his actions were indefensible and those of a rebel. Perhaps a more penetrating study of the status of the Congregation in the United States before and after approbation could be made.

Outside of definitive approval and more growth there are few pleasant experiences for Father Moreau recounted in the latter part of this work. The community was brought to the brink of financial ruin by an irresponsible steward. Help from sources in France and America was not forthcoming. A new adversary, Father Drouelle, joined Sorin in a serious bid to remove the Father Founder from his office of Superior-General. There were numerous appeals to Rome and the community was threatened with dissolution. The strife resulted in the liquidation of the property at the mother house and the exit of Father Moreau from the Congregation.

While the authors give an accurate and favorable picture of Father Moreau, they hand down a serious condemnation of Sorin and Drouelle. The reader finds it hard to believe that the latter two could have been so wrong.

No doubt the striking point about the whole study is the character of Father Moreau. While the Congregation was falling to pieces around him he showed remarkable courage, straightforward honesty, sincerity, and a dependence on grace. Although many concerns of his correspondence were unpleasant, there is a distinct kindness in his letters. His obedience to Rome, his defense of the principles of the religious life, his irreproachable priestly conduct throughout the numerous sad incidents cannot fail to impress the reader.

In restoring their Father Founder to his place in the community the Fathers, Brothers, and Sisters of Holy Cross have faced a difficult issue squarely and righted an injustice. They now pray that God will grant another blessing, the sanctification of Basil Anthony Mary Moreau.

JOHN LOUIS YARDAN, C.S.C.

PATTERNS FOR EDUCATIONAL GROWTH. By Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C.. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1958. Pp. xv + 71.

This slender volume by the president of the University of Notre Dame contains a series of addresses delivered by Father Hesburgh to the faculty at the annual inaugural Mass of the University. Recently reappointed to another term as its president, these pages afford a glimpse into the thinking which lies behind the educational policies which have brought Notre Dame and Father Hesburgh to the respectful attention of educators everywhere. While delivered over a period of six years, the pieces possess an underlying unity which gives the reader the impression he is reading a single complete essay, an impression which speaks well for the consistency of the policy which they articulate. That policy may be described as the continuing effort to perfect the whole man which, in twentieth century America, means the transmission of the Christian heritage enriched and revitalized by a special affinity to the pressing problems of our time. Most agree that the physical challenges have been met; the spiritual ones await the answers men must forge from Christian wisdom. But this wisdom, Father Hesburgh emphasizes, is imbibed within a definite historical context and must reflect something of the latter's perspective if it is to lend itself to an adequate response. Today that means, among other things, integrating science with wisdom and re-establishing a vagrant Democracy upon its Christian roots.

In an essay entitled *Mission of a Catholic University,* Father Hesburgh describes the role of the Catholic university in this process as the restoration of the intellectual order without which human progress becomes impossible. Order begins with a commitment to wisdom and progress lies open before that wisdom which is wisely conscious of the world it orders. Wisdom's children today have for their task nothing less than continuing the work of the Incarnation by consecrating everything human to the service of God. The task becomes possible through Christian faith, a source of optimism which will never falter, for the work of Christ thus begun in time is ordered to eternity and the Christian humanist knows his slightest labor is not without eternal meaning.

In a day when professional educators are divided over basic principles, it is refreshing and encouraging to contemplate the timeless sovereignty of Christian wisdom over the mind of man and hear it proclaimed by a spokesman as forceful and able as Father Hesburgh.

JOSEPH V. GALLAGHER, C.S.P.

WORSHIP: THE LIFE OF THE MISSIONS. By Johannes Hofinger, S.J., and others. Translated from the German by Mary Perkins Ryan. Preface by The Most Rev. Raymond A. Lane, M.M., D.D. University of Notre Dame Press, 1958. Pp. x + 342. $4.75.

Fr. Johannes Hofinger, S.J., the principal author of *Worship: The Life of the Missions,* hardly needs introduction to those engaged in the catechetical or the liturgical apostolates in the United States. Now it is our pleasure to welcome another work of major importance from the pen of this gifted and experienced Austrian Jesuit, one which will be of interest to all who are genuinely alive to the needs of the twentieth-century Church. In the writing of this book certain chapters (eleven out of a total of twenty-four) were contributed by Jesuit confreres of Father Hofinger, Frs. Josef Kellner, Paul Brunner, and Johannes Seffer, all colleagues of his at the Institute of Mission Apologetics at Manila.

The aim of the authors was both broad and comprehensive: to present in a single volume an analysis of the profound and intrinsic connection between worship—the first and most important activity of the Whole Christ, Head and members—and missionary evangelization—the task of bringing the Divine Word and Life to men precisely to make of them true worshippers of the Father. Their work is both theoretical and practical. It displays real mastery of liturgical history, of the principles of the liturgy itself, and of contemporary theology, as well as the fruits of years of practical missionary endeavor in China. It is written in a simple, straightforward style which recommends it to a wide group of readers. The fact that it has in mind specifically missionary lands does not in any way lessen its value for Catholics everywhere. It could well have been entitled "Worship: The Life of the *Church.*" It is well known today that many missionaries are actively promoting the liturgical apostolate and that the Holy See, for pastoral reasons, has made notable concessions to certain missionary territories to enable them to provide a more vital and effective worship for their people. The rest of the Church can ill afford to ignore these manifestations of apostolic zeal and of wise maternal concern, for there is much that all can learn from the life of any section or part of the Church Universal.

The book is divided into six parts, treating, respectively, the state of the liturgy in mission countries in the past and at present, the true nature of Christian worship, the problem of corporate worship in the absence of a priest, music and art in Christian worship, the administration of the sacraments, and, finally, factors in the liturgical renewal of the missions. At the end of the book there are added three appendices, one containing the missionary requests formulated at the Assisi Congress, and the others offering outlines of sermons for the Sundays and principal feasts of the year.

What immediately strikes the reader is the thoroughness of treatment. It is difficult to think of an important aspect of the relationship between the liturgy and missionary life which is not considered in some detail. Another recurring impression one receives is that of the courage of the authors in stating honestly the problems that face the missionary today with a charity and balance of approach, however, completely free from a carping, hypercritical attitude toward the admitted and regretted imperfections of the *status quo*. This is evidenced, above all, in the last chapter of the book, entitled "What We Desire and Request of the Church," which is a tribute to the competence and eminently sound judgment of Father Hofinger.

In the first two chapters, both by Father Hofinger, we are given in less than thirty pages an exceptionally clear statement of how effective Christian worship can be as a missionary force, how effective it actually was during the early ages of the Church, and what it should contribute to the total formation of the Christian community. It will no doubt come as a surprise to many, for example, to learn that during the first five centuries of Christianity it was almost entirely to their active participation in the liturgy that the Christians of that time owed their knowledge of the faith. It was a living, participated worship, too, that formed the faithful solidly and deeply in their life of prayer, keeping before their minds and hearts the great role of Christ as our Way to the Father, the primacy of the prayer of praise and thanksgiving, and a real understanding of sacrificial worship—basic Christian notions which can be grasped only imperfectly apart from an active liturgical life. It was a living worship, again, which fostered the sense of community so characteristic of the early Church and which, finally, was the single most important factor in the development of an apostolic, missionary spirit.

Other chapters especially worthy of note are those on Scripture readings (chapter 8) and the use of the Psalms in the missions (chapter 9), both of which are applicable in large measure to so-called Christian countries. So, too, the text proposed by Father Kellner for a communal Sunday service in the absence of a priest (chapter 12) could be adopted with great profit in many places in the United States where weekly Mass is an impossibility and where, in default of the Mass, recourse is had so often to little more than the recitation of the Rosary. The reviewer knows of a juvenile home where this very text has been introduced and has been warmly received by a group of boys who can assist at Mass only once a month. By means of this text, based upon the structure of a fore-Mass, they join actively in genuine, liturgically inspired communal worship which unites them in mind and heart to the liturgy of the day and which develops in them a sense of supernatural oneness with their more fortunate brothers in Christ who are, this very day, privileged to offer with their priests the Eucharistic Sacrifice.

In conclusion, let it suffice to say that this is a book which should be called to the attention of all engaged in the various forms of the modern apostolate. Mention should be made, finally, of the splendid job of Englishing the original German done by Mary Perkins Ryan.

FRANK B. NORRIS, S.S.

THE ANGELS. By Pascal P. Parente. St. Meinrad, Indiana: Grail Publications, 1958. Pp. v + 158. $3.00

During the past few years there has been considerable conjecture about the existence of intelligent creatures on other planets. In the midst of these considerations, there has been a tendency to overlook the Catholic teaching about the certain, and definitely not merely conjectural, existence of an entire order of created intelligent beings known as angels. Thus, at this juncture, the appearance of this volume, authored by one of America's outstanding scholars and teachers in the field of sacred theology, is most opportune and welcome.

Father Parente's excellent work is definitely not a mere English translation of the *tractatus de angelis* found in one of our contemporary manuals of theology for the use of seminarians. It is a book written for the people of this country and of this time. It is characterized by magnificent accuracy and by a remarkable completeness of doctrine. Furthermore, despite the fact that it seems to have been written primarily for the cultivated lay Catholic, it will prove greatly advantageous to the priest who is interested in renewing his acquaintance with a highly important, but too frequently overlooked, treatise in the field of dogmatic theology.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

AN AMERICAN AMEN. By John La Farge. New York: Farrar, Strauss, and Cudahy, 1958. Pp. x + 254. $3.75.

Knowing Father La Farge is a privilege and a pleasure for thousands of our people, and some new friends will know him and old friends will know him better through his *Amen*. Perhaps some few clerics can still be found who are devotees of the good old days and of a paradise far away. For his part, Father La Farge is gratefully and profoundly an American. He is willing and happy to say "Amen" to all the best things in the nation, above all to our commitment to freedoms and to human rights and dignity.

Take two passages to see the simplicity and relevance with which Father La Farge is working and has long been working with the good things of both our local and our national life. Saying that of course he loves all people, he runs right on to say that this might mean mere sentimentality if he did not also go with the proven techniques by which people can live a proper human life: "If I did not love the human race in the reality of its existing human institutions: the human race in families, in marriage and education, in its myriad vocational and professional activities and groupings, in its communal living, in its communities, and in that realization of man's inner greatness under God that we call our nation." In the second passage he says that the city planner, though important, is not to be a czar; rather he is to reverence the human person and human dignity, and the dignity of the fundamental human institutions by which man expresses the deepest instinct in him, namely his reverence for God. "All this implies substantial open-mindedness on the part of those who set their intelligence to this movement: a readiness to acknowledge a purposiveness, a finality in life, over and above the attainment of immediate ends."

In the second part the author speaks as a priest, and here again he says "Amen," and says that the Church speaks to the priest in praise of the Creator, or in petition and sorrow or thanksgiving, and the priest agrees. "He does not just *say* Amen; he *is* Amen: his life, his total commitment, is a response to the Creator's own commitment in his regard."

But in saying "Amen" to the Church he is saying it to what he honors as the work of the Church for human unity and peace, social peace, class peace and international peace. In the third part of the book where Father La Farge brings things less convincingly together than in the earlier parts, he is still committed with Lincoln to the freedom of all men everywhere and with Pius XII to what he happily calls "the world family" and to speaking, as he says we Americans must learn to speak, "in world terms."

LEO R. WARD, C.S.C.

Book Notes

During the past few weeks new editions of two very famous Catholic books have appeared. One is the 1958 edition of D'Arcy's *The Nature of Belief,* published by the B. Herder Book Company of St. Louis, Mo. The other is a third edition of the famed *Compendium iuris publici ecclesiastici* by Father Lawrence R. Sotillo, S.J. Father Sotillo died before the 1958 edition of his work could be prepared, and the dean of his faculty at Comillas, Father Edward F. Regatillo, S.J., oversaw the publication. The Sotillo-Regatillo volume is one of the best in the world from the point of view of doctrinal accuracy. The D'Arcy book, on the other hand, continues to pay great attention to the viewpoints of a theory of knowledge most remarkable for its ability to overlook all that has been learned in the field of Thomistic metaphysics.

The past few months have been remarkable for the appearance of a great many books on the origin and the history of great religious communities within the Catholic Church. One of the best of these has come out within the past few weeks, unfortunately in a language other than English. It is *Il Terz'Ordine Regolare di S. Francesco attraverso i secoli,* by Fr. Rafael Pazzelli. T.O.R. It is a book of 384 pages, and it sells for 2200 Italian lire. Father Pazzelli is to be congratulated on the production of an interesting and highly informative book. It is one of the best of its kind to have appeared in recent years.

Books Received

THE APOCALYPSE OF ST. JOHN. By H. M. Feret, O.P. Translated by Elizabethe Corathiel. Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1958. Pp. viii + 273. $4.00.

THE SECULAR JOURNAL OF THOMAS MERTON. New York: Farrar, Straus and Cudahy, 1959. Pp. xv + 270. $3.75.

DELIVER US FROM EVIL. By M. Bernard Hygonet, O.F.M. Translated from the French by Sister M. Bernarda, O.S.F. Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press, 1958. Pp. 125. 95¢.

THE VIRTUES REVISITED. By Hubert Dunphy, O.F.M. Conv. Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press, 1958. Pp. 120. 95¢.

LIFE IN GOD'S LOVE. By Allan Wolter, O.F.M. Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press, 1958. Pp. 155. $2.50.

WHAT IS CATHOLIC ACTION? AN INTRODUCTION TO THE LAY APOSTOLATE. By Jeremiah Newman. With a Preface by Msgr. Léon Suenens, Auxiliary Bishop of Malines. Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1958. Pp. xii + 164. $3.50.

OUR LADY IN EDUCATION. The Proceedings of the Workshop on Our Lady in Education conducted at the University of Dayton, Dayton, Ohio, from June 11 to June 18, 1958, in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the Lourdes Apparitions. Edited by Louis J. Faerber, S.M. Dayton: The Marian Library, 1958. Pp. vii + 208. No price given.

THE MASS THROUGH THE YEAR. Volume I, Advent to Palm Sunday. By Aemiliana Löhr, Nun of Herstelle. Translated by I. T. Hale. Foreword by Damasus Winzen, O.S.B. Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1958. Pp. xix + 330. $4.50.

ECHOES OF ASSISI. By Liam Brophy, Franciscan Tertiary. Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press, 1958. Pp. x + 208. $3.95.

ACROSS THE NIGHT. Adventures in the Supranormal. New York: Philosophical Library, Inc., 1958. Pp. xii + 110. $3.75.

MAN IS YOUR BROTHER. Television talks and sermons by the Abbé Pierre. Translated by Ronald Matthews. Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1958. Pp. 135. $2.50.

FREEDOM OF CHOICE IN EDUCATION. By Virgil Blum, S.J. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1958. Pp. xv + 230. $3.95.

PRIEST'S MANUAL FOR THE FORTY HOURS' DEVOTION: HISTORY, LAW AND INDULGENCES, CEREMONIES, PRAYERS. By Charles V. Finnegan, O.F.M. Paterson, N. J.: St. Anthony Guild Press, 1959. Pp. xi + 92. $2.50.

THE ACATHISTOS HYMN: HYMN OF PRAISE TO THE MOTHER OF GOD: Greek Text, Translation and Introduction. By G. G. Meersseman, O.P. Fribourg, Switzerland: The University Press, 1958. Pp. 78. 3.85 Swiss francs.

PSYCHOLOGY, MORALITY AND EDUCATION. Edited and Introduced by Canon Fernard Van Steenberghen. Springfield, Illinois: Templegate, 1958. Pp. 128. $3.75.

WHY I AM A CATHOLIC. By Paul van Kuykendall Thomson. New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1959. Pp. 204. $2.75.

CONTEMPLATIVE LIFE IN THE WORLD. By A. M. Goichon. Translated by M. A. Bouchard. (Cross and Crown Series of Spirituality, n. 13). St. Louis and London: B. Herder Book Co., 1959. Pp. xiv + 230. $3.95.

THE LIGHT OF THE WORLD. LITURGICAL MEDITATIONS FOR THE WEEKDAYS AND SUNDAYS OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL YEAR. Volume II. The Easter Cycle. By Benedict Baur, O.S.B. Translated by Edward Malone, O.S.B. Revised Edition. St. Louis and London: B. Herder Book Co., 1959. Pp. xi + 383. $5.50.

IMITATION DU CHRIST. Nouvelle traduction littérale donnant le sens mystique. Introduction et Commentaires. By Gaston Bardet. Paris: Desclée De Brouwer, 1958. Pp. 628. 1800 French francs.